

INSTITUTE OF SOCIAL SCIENCES

Fundamentals of Marxist-Leninist Philosophy

MLSU - CENTRAL LIBRARY



104575CL



PROGRESS PUBLISHERS
MOSCOW, 1985

Editorial Board:

Prof. F.M. Burlatsky, Dr.Sc. (Philos.) managing editor,
Prof. G.S. Gudozhnik (executive editor), Dr.Sc. (Philos.),
Assist. Prof. A.A. Ignatenko, Cand.Sc. (Philos.), Prof. Yu.A.
Krasin, Dr.Sc. (Philos.), Assist. Prof. R. Martinez, Cand.Sc.
(Philos.), Prof. V.S. Semyonov, Dr.Sc. (Philos.), A.V. Shestopal,
Dr.Sc. (Philos.), Assist. Prof. V.V. Talanov, Cand.Sc.
(Philos.), Prof. F.I. Zakharov, Dr.Sc. (Philos.).

Team of authors

Prof. A.I. Arnoldov, Dr.Sc. (Philos.), Assist. Prof.
B.F. Bakurkin, Cand.Sc., (Philos.), Prof. F.M. Burlatsky, Dr.
Sc. (Philos.), Assist. Prof. A.N. Filatov, Cand.Sc. (Philos.),
Assist. Prof. Ya.G. Fogeler, Cand.Sc. (Philos.), A.A. Galkin,
Dr.Sc. (Hist.), Assist. Prof. V.D. Grazhdan, Cand.Sc. (Philos.)
Assist. Prof. A.G. Grigoryants, Cand.Sc. (Philos.), Prof.
G.S. Gudozhnik, Dr.Sc. (Philos.), Assist. Prof. A.A. Ignatenko,
Cand.Sc. (Philos.), Assist. Prof. I.R. Kamynin, Cand.Sc.
(philos.), Prof. Yu.A. Krasin, Dr.Sc. (Philos.), Assist. Prof.
G.G. Krombet, Cand.Sc. (Philos.), Assist. Prof. R. Martinez,
Cand. Sc. (Philos.), Prof. M.P. Mchedlov, Dr.Sc. (Philos.),
Prof. N.V. Motroshilova, Dr.Sc. (Philos.), Assist. Prof. L.A.
Nikitich, Cand.Sc. (Philos.), Prof. Z.M. Orudzhev, Dr.Sc.
(Philos.), Assist. Prof. V.I. Pokrovskaya, Cand. Sc. (Philos.),
Assist. Prof. V.M. Pasika, Cand.Sc. (Philos.), Yu.M. Pavlov,
Dr.Sc. (Philos.), Assist. Prof. A.P. Popov, Cand.Sc. (Law),
Assist. Prof. N.S. Semenkin, Cand.Sc. (Philos.), Prof. V.S.
Semyonov, Dr.Sc. (philos.), A.V. Shestopal, Dr.Sc. (philos.),
Assist. Prof. D.A. Silichev, Cand.Sc. (Philos.), Prof. E.P.
Sitkovsky, Dr.Sc. (Philos.), Assist. Prof. V.V. Sushinsky,
Cand.Sc. (Philos.), Assist. Prof. V.V. Talanov, Cand.Sc.
(Philos.), Assist. Prof. K.M. Truevtsev, Cand.Sc. (Philos.),
Assist. Prof. A.S. Vasilenko, Cand.Sc. (Philos.), Assist.
Prof. K.A. Zuev, Cand.Sc. (Philos.).

Research assistant: S.A. Ivanov

□ 23

Институт общественных наук

75

Основы марксистско-ленинской философии

на английском языке

© Институт общественных наук, 1985

English translation

© Institute of Social Sciences, 1985

ред. в Университетах Союза Советских Социалистических Республик

CONTENTS

Page

Part I

INTRODUCTION	11
1. The Philosophy of the Current Age	11
Emergence of a Scientific Philosophy. Philosophy and Revolutionary Practice. The Subject Matter of Philosophy. Materialism vs. Idealism.	
2. The Emergence and Development of Marxist Philosophy	23
Socio-Economic and Political Background of the Emergence of Marxist Philosophy. Marxist Philo- sophy and the Great Discoveries in Natural Science in the 19th Century. Ideological Pre- requisites for the Emergence of Marxist Philo- sophy. Sources of Marxist Philosophy. The Cre- ation of Dialectical and Historical Materi- alism: a Revolution in the History of Philoso- phy. Marxist Philosophy and Other Sciences. Relationship of Knowledge in Philosophy and Natural Science.	
3. The Leninist Stage in the Development of Marxist Philosophy	42
Historical Background of the Leninist Stage. A Revolution in Natural Science and the De- velopment of Marxist Philosophy by Lenin. The Unity of Dialectical and Historical Materi- alism.	
Chapter I. MATTER AND CONSCIOUSNESS	50
1. Matter and Forms of Its Existence	
Materialism vs. Idealism. Theories of Matter in the Philosophy of the Ancient East. Philosophy in Ancient Greece. Arabian Philosophy. Develop- ment of Philosophy in the Age of the Renaissan-	

ce and Bourgeois Revolutions. The Concept of Matter. Development of the Approach to Matter from the Viewpoint of Natural Science. Lenin's Criticism of Machism and Empirio-criticism.

The Concept of Matter Elaborated by Lenin.

Motion is the Mode of Existence of Matter.

Forms of the Motion of Matter. Space and Time. Modern Natural Science on Matter and Motion.

2. Consciousness, Its Origin and Essence 104

The Problem of Consciousness in the History of Philosophy. Origin of Consciousness.

Social Conditions for the Origin of Consciousness. The Essence of Consciousness.

Forms of Abstract Thinking. Differentiation of Consciousness. Social Character of Consciousness.

Chapter II. THE LAWS OF MATERIALIST DIALECTICS 132

1. Historical Forms and Levels of Development of Dialectics 132

Dialectics of Relations and Connections in Ancient Greek Philosophy. Dialectics of Motion. Dialectics of Development.

2. Materialist Dialectics as a Scientific Method of Thought. Cognition and Revolutionary Practice 144

Dialectics as a Method of Cognition and Practical Activity. Principles of Universal Interconnection and Development.

3. Basic Laws of Dialectics 151

The Law of Transformation of Quantitative into Qualitative Changes and Vice Versa. The Law of the Unity and Conflict of Opposites. The Law of the Negation of Negation.

4. Non-Basic Laws of Dialectics 167

The Law of the Unity of Content and Form. The Law of the Unity of Essence and Appearance. Reality and Possibility. Cause and Effect. Necessity and Chance. The Singular, Particular and Universal.

5. The Dialectics of Development of Socialism 183

Antagonism and Contradictions Under Socialist Construction. Dialectics of Developed Socialism.

6. Modern Bourgeois and Revisionist Distortions of Marxist-Leninist Dialectics 191

Materialist Dialectics and Natural Science. From Dialectics to Metaphysics. Neo-Positivism. Neo-Thomism. Existentialism. Criticism of Frankfurt School.

Chapter III. THE DIALECTICS OF THE PROCESS OF COGNITION 204

1. The Essence of Cognition. Object and Subject of Cognition 204

Essence of Cognition. Concept of Object of Cognition. Subject of Cognition.

2. The Process of Cognition and Practice 215

Sensory Cognition. Rational and Sensory Cognition. The Concept of Practice. Theoretical Activity. Unity of Theory and Practice. Theory of Truth. Practice as the Criterion of Truth. Partisanship and Scientificality.

3. The Methods of Scientific Cognition 234

Methods of Theoretical and Empirical Research. Cognition and Revolutionary Practice.

Part II		
Chapter I. MATERIALIST CONCEPTION OF HISTORY		242
1. Sociological Theories in the History of Philosophy	242	
The Antiquity and the Middle Ages. The Period of Formation and Development of Capitalism.		
2. The Prerequisites and Essence of a Materialist Understanding of Social Life	248	
Labour, the Basis and Essence of Human Society. The Basic Law of Human History. Historical Necessity vs. Freedom.		
3. Material Production, the Basis of Social Life..	259	
Production Structure. Productive Forces. Laws of Development of Productive Forces. Revolution in Science and Technology. Production Relations. Production Development: Its Sources and Motive Forces. Requirements on the Rise. The Law of Interaction of Productive Forces and Production Relations. The Role of the Environment and Population in Social Life. Demographic Problems.		
4. The Universal Historical Law of the Progressive Succession of Socio-Economic Formations	298	
The Basis and Superstructure. The Concept and Types of Socio-Economic Formations. Major Stages of Human Development.		
5. Civilisation and Social Progress	314	
Criticism of Bourgeois Conceptions of Civilisation. The Concept of Civilisation. Peculiarities of Development of Civilisations. Socialism -- The Formation of a Qualitatively New Civilisation. The Progress along the Path of		

Socialist Orientation.

6. Insolvency of Modern Bourgeois Sociology	348
Industrialism. Alarmists. Bourgeois Empirical Sociology. Functionalism and the Theories of "Social Change".	
Chapter II. SOCIAL CONSCIOUSNESS	358
1. Nature and Structure of Social Consciousness ..	358
Nature of Social Consciousness. Relative Independence of Social Consciousness. Structure of Social Consciousness.	
2. Levels of Social Consciousness	365
Social Psychology. Social Psychology and Ideology under Socialism. Peculiarities of Social Consciousness in Different Geographical Regions.	
3. Forms of Social Consciousness	380
Politics and Legal Consciousness. Philosophy. Morality. Science. Art. Religion and Its Elements.	
Chapter III. SOCIAL STRUCTURE	414
1. Classes, the Basis of Social structure	414
The Concept of Social Structure. The Origin of Classes. Lenin's Definition of Classes.	
2. Class Structure of the Contemporary Capitalist Society	421
Stages of Development of Capitalism. The Working Class. Office Workers and the Intelligentsia. The Class of Capitalists.	
3. The Socio-Class Structure of Asian, African	

and Latin American Countries 428

The Working Class. The Peasantry. The Bourgeoisie and Other Classes and Groups of Exploiters. The Middle Strata. The Marginal Urban Strata.

4. The Content and Forms of Class Struggle 440

Class Struggle as a Law of Antagonistic Formations. Basic Forms of Class Struggle by the Proletariat. Specific Features of Class Struggle Today. The Decisive Role of Popular Masses in History.

5. Social Structure of Socialist Society 448

The Current Epoch and Socialism. The Social Structure of the USSR: a General Description. Towards a Classless Society.

6. Nationality Relations 455

Nature of Nationality Relations. Concept of Ethnic Community. Ethno-Social Contradictions. National Contradictions in Developed Capitalist Countries. Nationality Problems in Countries of Africa, Asia and Latin America. Relations Between Nationalities under Socialism. Reactionary Essence of Racism. Polarity of Nationalism and Proletarian Internationalism.

7. The Individual and Society 482

The Concept of the Individual. The Individual in the History of Society. The Family and the Individual. Real Humanism.

Chapter IV. THE POLITICAL SYSTEM OF SOCIETY	507
1. Genesis and Nature of the State and the Political System of Society as a whole	507
Concept of the Political Organisation and Political System of Society. The Genesis of the State and Law. Nature of the State. Historical Types and Forms of the State.	
2. The Political System of Bourgeois Society Today	517
Nature and Forms of the Bourgeois State. Mechanism and Legal System of the Bourgeois State. Crisis of Bourgeois Democracy. Political Parties and Trade Unions. Bourgeois Theories of the Political System of Society.	
3. Political Forms of Transition from Capitalism to Socialism.....	535
Historical Imperative of the Dictatorship of the Proletariat. Diverse Forms of the Dictatorship of the Proletariat. On Future Forms of the Working-Class Power.	
4. The Political System of Advanced Socialist Society	549
The State of the Whole People. The Party in the Political System. Development of Socialist Democracy. Social Self-Government.	
5. Political Systems in the Developing Countries of Asia and Africa	563
Political Systems of Asian and African Countries. Political Systems in Capitalist-Oriented Countries. Political Systems in Socialist-Oriented Countries.	
6. The Development of Political Systems in Latin	

American Countries	573
Formation of Statehood. Political Regimes.	
Parties and Other Political Institutions.	
Impact of Cuban Experience. Two Lines of Po-	
litical Development.	
Chapter V. THE SOCIAL REVOLUTION	589
1. Revolution and Its Role in Social Development..	589
The Concept of Social Revolution. Role of	
Social Revolution. Historical Types of	
Social Revolutions. Multiformity of the	
Revolutionary Process.	
2. Objective Conditions and the Subjective Factor	
of Social Revolution	601
How to Defend a Revolution. The Struggle	
Against Counter-Revolution.	
3. Socialist Revolution	610
Higher Type of Social Revolutions. Align-	
ment of World Forces and the Revolutionary	
Process. Democratic and Socialist Tasks.	
Forms of Transition to Socialism.	
CONCLUSION	624

INTRODUCTION

In the current age, progressive development of mankind is gaining momentum. Never before has history witnessed changes or socio-economic transformations as radical as those we witness today. They include, first and foremost, the building of a new society in socialist countries, the struggle of the working class in the strongholds of imperialism for democracy and socialism, and national liberation movements for independence and social progress. Simultaneously, a scientific and technical revolution is taking place whose benefits can be used in the interests of broad working masses only if social life in its entirety is transformed along socialist lines.

The dominant trend of social development, the move of mankind from capitalism to socialism and communism under way now, has a place of its own in the multifaceted and complicated interrelationship of historical events. The move is linked to what was discovered and described by K. Marx as the accomplishment of the world historic mission of the working class, the most consistent opponent of exploitation of man by man, and of all forms of social and national oppression.

Together with the revolutionary processes of our age, Marxist-Leninist philosophy, the science of cognition and transformation of the world, is developing and spreading across all countries and continents.

1. The Philosophy of the Current Age

Emergence of a Scientific Philosophy

Like Marxism in its entirety, Marxist philosophy emerged in the

1840s to be developed fruitfully over several decades in the works by K. Marx (1818-1883), F. Engels (1820-1895), their comrades-in-struggle, and revolutionary social-democratic parties of the 19th century.

As an expression of vital interests of the working class, the emergence of Marxism was more than a mere reflection of the experience of workers' movement. The emergence and development of Marxist-Leninist philosophy relied on studies of

the latest developments in science of the 19th and the early 20th century, on the experience of revolutionary struggle of workers against exploitation, for freedom and a new society. The philosophical teaching of Marx, Engels and Lenin absorbed all the best in the development of world philosophical thought. Marxism comprised all the achievements in human thought of the preceding ages. K. Marx and F. Engels were men of truly encyclopaedic learning. Even the most ardent opponents of Marxism are not in a position to deny the profound knowledge of the founders of the teaching. They possessed a profound command of all the advances of scientific and social thought of their predecessors, of philosophy, political economy, history, and socialist teachings.

Their brilliant educational background, unsurpassed scientific intellect, rich socio-political and personal experience, irreproachable political honesty and a clear understanding of the relationship of political arbitrariness of bourgeois governments with the economic oppression of the working class and peasantry, their revolutionary resolve to wage the struggle for the complete liberation of the human personality and all workers -- all of these made K. Marx and F. Engels fearless proponents of the working class' cause, theoreticians and leaders of the proletariat, founders of the theory of scientific communism, of the philosophy of dialectical and historical materialism, the theoretical basis of communism.

Relying on their revolutionary theory, K. Marx and F. Engels waged the struggle for the establishment and strengthening of the First International, the revolutionary party of the working class in Germany, won, encouraged and organised followers and successors of their cause and teaching.

The triumph of socialist revolutions in the countries of Europe, Asia and Latin America, and an increasing proclivity of a number of current social and political trends for socialism, are the best demonstration of genuineness of Marxism. That this teaching is genuine is demonstrated by the fact that hundreds of millions of people are devoted followers of Marxism-Leninism; its genuineness is proved by the experience of humanity in its entirety, of all peoples and of every

single individual. People embrace Marxism because out of their personal experience, out of the experience of their struggle, out of the experience of the struggle of their class and of the struggle of progressive revolutionary forces they know that it is historically justified. The never-to-be forgotten words by V.I. Lenin, "The Marxist doctrine is omnipotent because it is true"¹ are confirmed time and again.

Karl Marx and his friend and comrade-in-arms, the gifted researcher, scholar and publicist Frederick Engels, left an enormous theoretical heritage. This is a magnificent source of wisdom used time and again by Communists today. Many events described by Marx and Engels are now remote or not-so-remote past. Many phenomena which had been incipient then were later to be developed on a grand scale. Yet the laws of development of nature and society discovered by Marx and Engels, the very method of analysis, their substantiation of the future proletarian revolution, socialism and communism, which found a brilliant confirmation in this century, make every thought and every idea of our classics a priceless heritage.

The present stage in the development of philosophy and of the whole Marxist theory is linked to the name of Vladimir Ilyich Lenin (1870-1924), the great revolutionary who led the first triumphant proletarian revolution in Russia.

V.I. Lenin's activities took place at a time when the centre of international revolutionary movement was transferred to Russia. In the midst of the movement of Russian proletariat, Lenin undertook a profound study and analysis of revolutionary experience of the struggle of the peoples of Europe, America, Asia and other regions of the world and developed the scientific theory of Marxism in all respects. He generalised the experience of a new age, the age of imperialism and proletarian revolutions. The Leninist stage of the development of Marxist philosophy still continues at present, at the stage of the transition of mankind from

1. V.I. Lenin, Collected Works, Vol. 19, p. 23

capitalism to socialism.

The era of Lenin's creative activities, new tasks facing the socialist revolution in Russia and the world communist movement, required the solution of a number of major theoretical problems. While solving them, Lenin was waging a struggle against revisionists and dogmatists who, disregarding the new facts of life, persisted in reiterating scholastically interpreted outmoded truths.

Like Marxist-Leninist doctrine in its entirety, Marxist-Leninist philosophy is developed and enriched with every new stage in the development of human society, every turn of history, every major scientific discovery.

In the current age, the need for a creative development of Marxist-Leninist philosophical theory has become more imperative than ever. Never before have revolutionary social transformations been so rapid or radical. Never before development of all fields of science, technology, culture, information, social consciousness as a whole has been so active or revolutionary.

International in essence, Marxist-Leninist philosophy summarises the experience of the entire world revolutionary process.

Philosophy and Revolutionary Practice

What do practising revolutionaries gain from studying Marxist-Leninist philosophy?

In a brief answer to this question, one might say that a study of Marxist-Leninist philosophy, which covers the basic laws of the development of nature, society and human thinking leads to an integrated, advanced revolutionary world outlook. This philosophy presents a single orderly system of views on radical social, natural, scientific and spiritual problems of today.

As a scientific world outlook and cognitive method, Marxist-Leninist philosophy represents an integral system of views on basic issues of the development of nature, society, and human consciousness, thus performing a generalising function as regards all the other sciences.

The basic distinguishing feature of Marxist-Leninist philosophy is its effective revolutionary nature "The philosophers," E. Marx said, "have only interpreted the world in

various ways; the point, however, is to change it.¹ On the basis of dialectics Marx and Engels substantiated the inevitability of the demise of capitalism as a result of the development of its internal contradictions.

Marxist-Leninist philosophy is most closely linked to historical practice and the world revolutionary process. Its basic social role is determined by the fact that it serves the revolutionary education of the proletariat, progressive forces of all workers and progressive intelligentsia. As such, Marxist-Leninist philosophy is the most profound theoretical basis for an analysis of the historical process, for a criticism of the obsolete capitalist order, for a forecast for all peoples' transition to a new social system.

Marxist-Leninist philosophy imparts an advanced theoretical outlook and contributes to a profound scientific analysis of complex problems related to the development of human society, of nature, and of social consciousness. This is the most important guarantee of a consistently scientific criticism of philosophical and other ideological trends opposing socialism, the guarantee of the only correct strategy and tactics of communist and workers' parties.

The principles of a Marxist-Leninist analysis of contemporary bourgeois philosophy require taking into account the entirety of theoretical, cognitive and social backgrounds of each of its trends. The content of all the systems and concepts of current bourgeois philosophy is linked to specific theoretical problems. It is not sufficient, however, merely to ascertain their theoretical content. One must understand, or construe this content out of its entire socio-historical context determined by socio-economic processes, by the course of class struggle, and by the distinguishing features of ideological and spiritual life of society. In an analysis of each philosophical concept, its natural science sources, i.e. the fields of knowledge and scientific discoveries leading to the emergence of idealistic concepts or used in idealistic philosophical systems, also have to be taken into account, since the advances of science can entail general theoretical and methodological difficulties of explaining them.

¹ Karl Marx, Frederick Engels, Collected Works, Vol. 5, p. 8

During Renaissance, with the outstanding development of specialised sciences, mechanics, physics, chemistry, and biology, philosophical knowledge embraced most general ideas of nature, society and man. The philosophy of history began developing independently, to be followed by sociology, aesthetics and numerous other fields of the science of philosophy.

The above illustrates the historical evolution of the subject of philosophy itself. It developed with the progress of natural and social sciences, with the accumulation of experience of man's activities. A branching out of individual sciences and a further development and differentiation of scientific knowledge were reflected in an increased emphasis in philosophy on radical, general theoretical issues pertaining to the development of nature and society.

The term "philosophy" itself derives from Greek philos, loving, and sophia, wisdom. Thus, linguistically "philosophy" can be defined as "love of wisdom", and the subject of philosophy, consequently, as "wisdom". In Ancient Greece, for example, a philosophical school of sophists, i.e. of teachers of wisdom, existed in the 6th-5th centuries B.C.

If one were to be content with this general definition of philosophy as wisdom or loving wisdom, it might be concluded that all people experience a measure of "love of wisdom". Everyone possesses a certain set of socio-political, ethical, religious, aesthetic and other beliefs. Everyone would be willing to argue on whether God exists or not, on what the essence of happiness is, on whether one likes or dislikes the existing political order in one's country, etc.

As opposed to his "mundane love of philosophising", the science of philosophy, as much as any other real science, pursues an orderly and logically consistent system of knowledge. What is the knowledge about? What is the subject matter of philosophy?

The subject matter of any science involves a certain part or aspect of reality and the corresponding objective laws. As opposed to natural and social sciences and the laws thereof, the subject of philosophy comprises the above mentioned universal interrelationships of objective reality -- of nature, society and human thinking.

It should also be taken into consideration that the modern capitalist world is characterised not only by the strengthening of political reaction and reactionary ideology but also by the strengthening of forces of progress and democracy. The process of democratisation of intelligentsia (and, consequently, of philosophers also) in accordance with their social composition, outlook, and attitude to social phenomena, is underway. In their defence of materialism in the struggle against idealism, Marxists-Leninists pursue the interests of stronger unity of the workers' revolutionary liberation movement and take into account the socio-political position of individual bourgeois philosophers.

The Subject Matter
of Philosophy

Philosophy came into existence long ago, approximately two and a half thousand to

three thousand years ago. Its origins go back to ancient India, China and Egypt, while its classical form of development was attained in Ancient Greece.

Ancient philosophy emerged and developed in a close relationship and struggle with religion, which offered a fantastic explanation of man's real environment. Since its emergence, philosophy pursued rational, scientific and theoretical knowledge based on practical experience of man's activities, on the logic of human consciousness. Initially, ancient philosophers tackled the problems posed by religion. They dealt with the origins of the world, of man, with the purpose of life, human calling and ethics. The philosophical teaching on nature, or natural philosophy, was the original basis of human knowledge. Antique philosophers, like Thales, Anaximander and Heraclitus undertook primarily to explain the diversity of natural phenomena.

With the development of human knowledge, of natural and later of social science, philosophy touched upon an increasing number of questions. It was already in ancient times that in China, India, and Ancient Greece separate philosophies emerged, like the teaching on existence or being (ontology), on cognition (epistemology), on scientific thinking (logic), and on morals (ethics).

matical methods in science, and of cybernetics and modelling methods; or discovering the "inability" of Marxist philosophy to meet the challenge of new advances and new issues in natural science, new problems of social development.

The fallacy of the above mentioned conceptions consists in that they are at variance with the nature of philosophical knowledge itself.

The knowledge is entrenched in the requirements of social development itself; its object is finding and elaborating on intrinsic values and problems, i.e. the universal conceptions of the world, its past and future, the most general principles of being, knowledge and practical activities, the purpose of man's existence, of social progress, of the outlook for the development of mankind, etc.

Philosophical knowledge is a form of social consciousness reflecting the results of scientific and social development, the ideals and world outlook of different classes, social contradictions and conflicts in individual countries or at given periods. It is for these reasons that K. Marx described philosophy as the "intellectual quintessence of its time" and "the living soul of culture".¹

Life demonstrates that under the conditions of accelerated and more complicated social development, of the growth of revolutionary transformations in the world, of rapid progressive development of science and technology, and of its social and environmental consequences becoming more pronounced, the need increases for a philosophical analysis of fundamental problems and laws of social development and scientific cognition, of the world outlook orientation of man's spiritual and practical activities.

Materialism vs Idealism

The formation and development of the subject matter of the science of philosophy have been taking place over centuries of struggle between two

¹. Karl Marx, Frederick Engels, Collected Works, Vol. 1,
p. 195.

It is sometimes argued that it would be more correct to define philosophy in terms of its subject matter as the universal science in its widest sense. That would mean, however, unnecessarily expanding the subject of philosophy, making it a repository of all sciences. At the dawn of human knowledge, when science was still incipient, philosophy was indeed the science of all sciences embracing all the current knowledge. Since then, however, over a period of two thousand years, physics, chemistry, biology, sociology and other sciences underwent major development, branched out of philosophy which was left to deal with the most general laws of material being and human thinking.

Philosophy is a system of views on man's environment. It provides answers to the questions on the nature of the world, on whether all the phenomena and processes have something in common, on whether reality is cognisable, on what is truth, etc. The role, significance and functions of philosophy are objective. Development of social cognition naturally presents radical problems which no science other than philosophy can solve; their definite solution has been enriching the entire process of social cognition, in particular, with universal theories, methodologies, systems of categories, improving the standards of theoretical thinking of the epoch as a whole.

"Theoretical thinking," F. Engels wrote, "is an innate quality only as regards natural capacity. This natural capacity must be developed, improved, and for its improvement there is as yet no other means than the study of previous philosophy."¹

Practice refutes various conceptions of nihilistic world outlook concerning the alleged present decline of the role and importance of philosophy, of problems pertaining to world outlook in general in the system of scientific knowledge and in practical activities; or concerning an automatic elimination of all the world outlook problems and orientations by the development of science and technology, introduction of mathe-

¹. Frederick Engels, Dialectics of Nature, Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1976, pp. 42-43.

philosophical idealism, V.I. Lenin observed, are "fideism, more or less weakened and diluted."¹

The basic question of philosophy, that of which is primary, nature or spirit, matter or consciousness, has another aspect, that of whether correct cognition of the world is possible. Depending on the answer to the latter question, philosophers are divided into agnostics, who claim the world is not cognisable, and those who accept the cognition of objective reality.

Why is it that idealistic doctrines appear and spread? This can be explained, in the final analysis, by the party interests of individual social classes. Philosophical idealism, Lenin said, "leads into the quagmire, into clerical obscurantism (where it is anchored by the class interests of the ruling classes)".² In most cases in the history of philosophy, idealist philosophy was developed and supported by reactionary social forces and classes in close alliance with religion.

Besides class origins, idealism also has epistemological (i.e., relating to the theory of knowledge) origins which involve an exaggeration of one of the traits, or aspects of cognition and making it absolute, or independent truth. Idealism thrives on the difficulties of cognition by man, of science, as distinct from religion, which, as a rule, thrives on ignorance.

The question of the progressiveness of materialist philosophical doctrines and of the reactionary nature of the idealistic ones should not be approached in a dogmatic manner. Under certain specific historical conditions, some materialistic doctrines (e.g. the materialism of German vulgar materialists of the third quarter of the 19th century, that of Büchner, Vogt and Moleschott) played a far from a progressive role in the scientific and socio-political life of the time. Nevertheless, Hegel's philosophical doctrine, as seen below, despite the fallacy of the idealistic principle under-

1. V.I. Lenin, Collected Works, Vol. 14, p. 155.

2. Ibid., Vol. 38, p. 363

tendencies, two parties of philosophy, those of materialism and idealism. "Recent philosophy is as partisan as was philosophy two thousand years ago," V.I. Lenin stressed.¹ Philosophical materialism and philosophical idealism represent two opposite answers to the basic question of philosophy, that of interrelationship of thinking and being, spirit and nature. "Which is primary, spirit or nature," Engels wrote. "The answers which the philosophers gave to this question split them into two great camps."² Those who profess that what is primary is nature, or, more specifically, the objective material environment of man, are materialists. On the other hand, those who accept the primacy of spirit or the idea, are idealists.

What does being a materialist in philosophy mean? It means an understanding that the world around man, the sun, the moon, the stars, the whole outer space, the Earth, mountains, forests, oceans, plants and animals, and other human beings exist objectively, independently of human consciousness, and that the human being itself is an element of great world wherefrom it appeared and wherein it lives.

That is not the whole story, however. People have always asked the question, where nature came from, when and in what manner it appeared, what the reason is of its existence. The answer to this question offered by religion is that nature is the work of God, the creator of nature and the reason of its existence. A usual additional claim by all religions is that God is a spirit not unlike the human spirit, yet of a superior order, that is, eternal, omnipotent, omniscient, etc. This, the religious approach to the origins of nature essentially coincides with that of philosophical idealism, since, like philosophical idealism, religion believes that God is the origin of all things. In turn, all kinds of

1. V.I. Lenin, Collected Works, Vol. 14, p. 358.

2. K. Marx, F. Engels, Selected Works in three volumes, Vol. 3, Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1976, p. 346.

phers espousing idealism on the basis of a false idealistic premise, while the dialectical method can be developed consistently only on the basis of a materialistic premise, i.e. the acceptance of the primacy of nature (matter) and the secondary nature of spirit (consciousness, thought).

Marxist-Leninist philosophy is characterised by an organic unity of dialectical materialism with its philosophical and sociological element, historical materialism, which studies the general laws of development of human society. As the science of the most general laws of the development of nature, society, and human thinking, Marxist-Leninist philosophy is closely linked with other sciences and with the revolutionary historical practice.

The relationship consists in the following. In the elaboration of basic laws, philosophy relies on the achievements of other sciences and of revolutionary practice. In turn, the basic laws established by philosophy serve as the methodology of scientific cognition and of revolutionary activities, become the underlying basis of, and certain theoretical guidance for the cognition and transformation of the world.

The great scientific discovery by Marx, the materialistic interpretation of history and of the laws of development of human society is an integral part of Marxian philosophical doctrine. It was only the theory of historical materialism that made a consistently materialistic world outlook possible. "From this Marxist philosophy, which is cast from a single piece of steel, you cannot eliminate one basic premise, one essential part, without falling a prey to bourgeois-reactionary falsehood."¹

2. The Emergence and Development of Marxist Philosophy

Marxist philosophy -- dialectical and historical materialism -- is a natural result of the development of preceding progressive thought, the result of revolutionary scientific feat achieved by K. Marx and F. Engels.

¹. V.I. Lenin, Collected Works, Vol. 14, p. 326

lying it, played a certain progressive role in the history of philosophical thought.

What is the explanation of this paradox? It is that philosophical doctrines also differ concerning the question of methodology, or approach to things, objective phenomena, or way of thinking. This leads to a distinction between dialecticians as vs. metaphysical philosophers.

The word "metaphysics" (from Greek ta metá tά physika, "the things after the physics") used to mean the philosophical task of cognising "transcendental being". The classics of Marxism-Leninism gave a new meaning to the term -- a manner of thinking based on an anti-dialectical understanding of reality.

The metaphysical method in philosophy (and in any other science as well) draws a sharp distinction between one object and another, one aspect of an object and another, ignoring the relationship between them, or their mutual interconnection. Secondly, it regards reality in its entirety -- mountains, seas, rivers, flora, fauna, human beings, and the forms of social life -- as immutable and never changing.

Metaphysical thinking finds a reflection in numerous ultra-left ideological tendencies, including various theories of utopian socialism pursuing an ideal and eternal model of socialism.

As opposed to metaphysics, dialectics, as defined by Lenin, is "the most comprehensive and profound doctrine of development, and the richest in content".¹ According to dialectics, no object is immutable; nature in its entirety and all objects, human society and individuals undergo continuous motion, change, and development, passing through the elimination of contradictions and the struggle of opposites. As for rest and equilibrium, they are not rejected by dialectics but are considered elements of motion.

Many pre-Marxian materialist philosophical doctrines were distinguished by their metaphysical and anti-dialectical nature. The dialectical method was developed primarily by philoso-

¹. V.I. Lenin, Collected Works, Vol. 21, p. 53.

Socio-Economic and Political
Background of the Emergence
of Marxist Philosophy

Marxist philosophy is different in principle from all the preceding and presently existing philosophical views.

It is not a philosophy in the traditional meaning, i.e., a system of finite knowledge, as a science of sciences; it is philosophy proper, since it deals with the problems of world outlook. As a new philosophy which emerged on the basis of a revolution effected by Marx and Engels in the history of philosophy, its distinction from the previous philosophy consists in that it was the first consistent application of materialist world outlook to all the basic fields of knowledge.

Marxist philosophy was a natural consequence of the development of all the fundamental fields of knowledge and an answer to the questions posed by the philosophical and socio-logical thought. As Lenin stressed, Marxism emerged not "away from the high road of the development of world civilisation. On the contrary, the genius of Marx consists precisely in his having furnished answers to questions already raised by the foremost minds of mankind".¹

The social need for a scientific philosophical theory based on new principles arose as a number of historical prerequisites for it appeared. The most important of the latter were socio-historical processes inherent in capitalism, discoveries in natural sciences, and development of philosophy proper. The need arose for a new scientific theory of the historical process to substantiate the place and role of the social classes of the time, for the prospects and the results of liberation struggle.

Marxist philosophy emerged in the mid-19th century in Western Europe, when the capitalist mode of production already dominated Britain, France, and, to a significant extent, Germany, and when the development of capitalist relations of production revealed their antagonistic nature and the existence of insurmountable contradictions between labour and capital.

Whereas bourgeois philosophy and sociology of the 17th

1. V.I. Lenin, Collected Works, Vol. 19, p. 23

The spontaneously dialectic tendency of the generalisation stage in the development of chemistry was vividly reflected in Mendeleev's discovery, the essence of which consisted in the establishment of a general law of relationship between, and changes in specific properties of chemical elements. In its theoretical form, the periodic law was of an heuristic importance, since it made possible a prediction of properties of individual chemical elements and of their groups, including those not yet discovered. "By means of the -- unconscious -- application of Hegel's law of the transformation of quantity into quality," Engels wrote, "Mendeleev achieved a scientific feat which it is not too bold to put on a par with that of Leverrier in calculating the orbit of the until then unknown planet Neptune."¹

A most important role in the development of the system of scientific knowledge in the mid-19th century and in the development of biology itself as a science was played by discoveries made by Charles Darwin (1809-1882).

The elaboration of Darwin's theory of evolution was linked to dialectical forms of thinking. A morphological study of different species of fauna and flora led to the discovery of their internal genetic line of development and to a historical organisation of different levels of the organic world. In an evaluation of the historic importance of Marxist sociology, Lenin stressed that a comparison of Marx's discovery with that by Darwin was profoundly justified.

The fact that the analysis of the laws of evolution of species took into account the experimental practice of generations, i.e. artificial selection, with a corresponding adjustment of species to their natural environment, was an enormously important element of Darwin's discovery. Darwin's work as a selectionist enabled him to understand the role of man's transformation activity as regards organic nature, and to see it as analogous to the natural evolution of the organic world.

1. Frederick Engels, Dialectics of Nature, p. 68.

Marxist Philosophy and the Great Discoveries in Natural Science in the 19th century

At the time Marxist philosophy emerged, a number of important branches of natural science were moving from the data collection stage to the generalisation stage. Besides a synthesis of individual sciences became necessary. "In doing so, however," Engels wrote, "natural science enters the field of theory and here the methods of empiricism will not work, here only theoretical thinking can be of assistance."¹

The great discoveries in natural science made in the mid-19th century created the need for new theoretical methods of research and generalisation. The category of polarity, expressing the unity and conflict of opposites, became the most important category in physics.

The discovery of the law of conservation and transformation of energy was of immense importance in the development of the 19th century natural science. The law demonstrated the indivisibility of matter and motion and the fact that universal interrelationship and interaction of different forms of motion were the only objective cause of changes occurring in nature. As a demonstration of an inalienable relationship of motion and matter, and of it not having been created and incapable of being destroyed, the law of conservation and transformation of energy became a form of dialectical understanding of motion from the viewpoint of natural science. The objective content of the law showed that when cognition has to deal with general laws of matter and its universal forms of existence, physics enters the sphere of philosophy, and vice versa.

Chemistry, on the basis of the atomistic theory and the single theory of chemical composition, and especially of the periodic table of the elements discovered by Dmitry Mendeleev (1834-1907), the eminent Russian chemist, not only entered the stage of generalisation of its branches, but also began establishing the interrelationship with physics.

¹. Frederick Engels, Dialectics of Nature, p. 42

The significance of Hegel's philosophy consisted in his analysis of basic laws and categories of dialectics, which he treated as a scientific method.

Important as Hegel's philosophy was, it was still based on the false premise of philosophical idealism. Marx and Engels reappraised and refined Hegel's dialectics from a materialistic standpoint to create a new, materialist doctrine of dialectical development of nature, society and human thinking.

The materialist philosophy of German philosopher Ludwig Feuerbach (1804-1872), especially his Das Wesen des Christentums (The Essence of Christianity, 1841) played an important role in the elaboration of a materialistic world outlook by Marx and Engels. In that work Feuerbach proclaimed the triumph of materialism and atheism while sharply criticising Hegel's idealism. This accelerated the move by Marx and Engels to the position of philosophical materialism. Feuerbach's materialism, however like that of the French materialists of the 18th century, had serious limitations. In particular, Feuerbach failed to understand the scientific importance of Hegel's dialectics and remained as a whole, a metaphysical materialist.

A major role in the approach to Marxist philosophy, especially to the Marxist theory of historical materialism, was played by the ideas of the utopian socialism of Saint-Simon (1760-1825), Fourier (1772-1837) and Owen (1771-1858), whose criticism of the capitalist order was utilised by the founders of Marxism in the elaboration of their philosophical doctrine. Of considerable importance in the elaboration of the philosophical doctrine of Marxism were economic theories of British economists Adam Smith (1723-1790) and David Ricardo (1772-1823), in particular the labour theory of value.

The philosophical doctrine of the great teacher of the working class K. Marx was, according to V.I. Lenin, a direct and immediate continuation of the doctrine of the greatest in philosophy, political economy and socialism. Not only did Marx continue the doctrines of his predecessors, Hegel and Feuerbach, economists Adam Smith and Ricardo, utopian socialists Saint-Simon, Fourier and

on of the 18th century, the author of the utopian idea of the Republic of Equals, and the most consistent theoretician of the rationalism of the Enlightenment. The programme of nationalisation of each and every kind of property, proclaimed by Babeuf as the extreme form of social protest of the masses, was to serve later as a theoretical source of left-wing radicalism. This tradition was continued in the social philosophy accompanying the French Revolution of 1830-1848, most remarkably expounded by Louis Auguste Blanqui.

The egalitarian Blanquist theories which were spreading at the time when Marxism was increasingly penetrating the workers' movement in the West, often played a conservative role, being a theoretical source of various currents of utopian socialism with conservative and even reactionary aspects. These schools of thought were represented by Proudhon, the author of Philosophy of Poverty, and Dühring, whose names went down in the history of philosophy and political thought mainly because their views became the subject of brilliant criticism, leading to the profound elaboration of the doctrine of scientific communism, by K. Marx and F. Engels in their works, The Poverty of Philosophy and Anti-Dühring.

Sources of Marxist
Philosophy

Marxism immediately followed German classical philosophy of the late 18th and early

19th centuries, represented primarily by Hegel and Feuerbach.

Hegel (1770-1831) was a major German classical philosopher of the early 19th century. "This new German philosophy culminated in the Hegelian system," Engels wrote. "In this system - and herein is its great merit - for the first time the whole world, natural, historical, intellectual, is represented as a process, i.e., as in constant motion, change, transformation, development; and the attempt is made to trace out the internal connection that makes a continuous whole of all this movement and development."¹

¹. F. Engels, Anti-Dühring, p. 34.

The significance of Hegel's philosophy consisted in his analysis of basic laws and categories of dialectics, which he treated as a scientific method.

Important as Hegel's philosophy was, it was still based on the false premise of philosophical idealism. Marx and Engels reappraised and refined Hegel's dialectics from a materialistic standpoint to create a new, materialist doctrine of dialectical development of nature, society and human thinking.

The materialist philosophy of German philosopher Ludwig Feuerbach (1804-1872), especially his Das Wesen des Christentums (The Essence of Christianity, 1841) played an important role in the elaboration of a materialistic world outlook by Marx and Engels. In that work Feuerbach proclaimed the triumph of materialism and atheism while sharply criticising Hegel's idealism. This accelerated the move by Marx and Engels to the position of philosophical materialism. Feuerbach's materialism, however like that of the French materialists of the 18th century, had serious limitations. In particular, Feuerbach failed to understand the scientific importance of Hegel's dialectics and remained as a whole, a metaphysical materialist.

A major role in the approach to Marxist philosophy, especially to the Marxist theory of historical materialism, was played by the ideas of the utopian socialism of Saint-Simon (1760-1825), Fourier (1772-1837) and Owen (1771-1858), whose criticism of the capitalist order was utilised by the founders of Marxism in the elaboration of their philosophical doctrine. Of considerable importance in the elaboration of the philosophical doctrine of Marxism were economic theories of British economists Adam Smith (1723-1790) and David Ricardo (1772-1823), in particular the labour theory of value.

The philosophical doctrine of the great teacher of the working class K. Marx was, according to V.I. Lenin, a direct and immediate continuation of the doctrine of the greatest minds in philosophy, political economy and socialism. Not only did Marx continue the doctrines of his predecessors, philosophers Hegel and Feuerbach, economists Adam Smith and David Ricardo, utopian socialists Saint-Simon, Fourier and

Owen. On the basis of the theoretical achievements of their predecessors K. Marx and F. Engels created a philosophical doctrine which was new in principle, and which represented, for the first time in the history of philosophy, a combination of philosophical materialism and dialectical methodology, and the first scientific and materialistic explanation of the life of human society.

This became a genuine revolution in science. The science of philosophy which before the time had been the domain of a limited number of educated people was turned by Marx and Engels into a revolutionary instrument for transforming the world in the hands of the proletariat. "Marx's philosophical materialism," Lenin wrote, "has shown the proletariat the way out of spiritual slavery in which all oppressed classes have hitherto languished."¹

The Creation of Dialectical and Historical Materialism: a Revolution in the History of Philosophy

The theoretical revolution effected by K. Marx and F. Engels in philosophy and their critical re-evaluation of preceding philosophical knowledge are parts of an

integrated creative process which became the basis for the emergence of Marxist scientific philosophy. According to F. Engels, already at the time when the new philosophical theory emerged the solid basis of old materialism was supplemented by the entire theoretical content of two thousand years of the development of philosophy and natural science and the two millennia of history itself. The entire development of philosophy following that time has been taking place on the basis of generalisation of scientific development and essential changes in social life, which fully justifies the description of Marxist philosophy as a scientific one.

The essence of the theoretical revolution carried out by Marx and Engels in philosophy lies in their elaboration of a scientific world outlook of the working class, in the applica-

1. V.I. Lenin, Collected Works, Vol. 19, p. 28.

tion of materialism to the explanation of social phenomena, in a materialistic justification of the role of practice, in the elaboration of the principle of unity of theory and practice, in the creation of a single materialist dialectical conceptions. "The application of materialist dialectics to the reshaping of all political economy from its foundations up, its application to history, natural science, philosophy and to the policy and tactics of the working class -- that was what interested Marx and Engels most of all, that was where they contributed what was most essential and new, and that was what constituted the masterly advance they made in the history of revolutionary thought."¹

The founders of Marxism revealed the real basis of all social relations, i.e. material production, which determines the existence and functioning of all the other components of the social organism. A study of the material production system enabled Marx and Engels to elaborate a theory on the decisive role of popular masses in history.

Marxist philosophy overcame the passive and contemplative nature of old materialism which was one of its deficiencies, since human cognition is not limited to a passive observation of current processes in nature and society. According to Engels, "it is precisely the alteration of nature by men, not solely nature as such, which is the most essential and immediate basis of human thought."² According to Marx's and Engels's doctrine, cognition is a part of human activities which is inalienably linked to practice and based thereon.

Marxist Philosophy and Other Sciences

Dialectical and historical materialism is a general theoretical and philosophical

basis of Marxism, of its political economy, scientific socialism, strategy and tactics of Marxist parties. The internal

1. V.I. Lenin, Collected Works, Vol. 19, p. 554.

2. Frederick Engels, Dialectics of Nature, p. 231.

harmony, integrity, iron logic and consistency of Marxism, acknowledged even by Marx's opponents, are the result of the application in all component parts of Marxism of a single method, of a single world outlook. Dialectical and historical materialism are the world outlook of the revolutionary working class and its Marxist parties. No thorough understanding of Marxism-Leninism is possible without a comprehension of Marxist philosophy.

What, then, is the subject matter of Marxist philosophy? How is Marxist philosophy related to other sciences — physics, mathematics, chemistry, biology, social history, sociology, literary studies, etc., and other individual sciences? A historical approach to the above questions facilitates an answer to them, since Marxist philosophy is the natural result of the entire preceding development of advanced philosophical and scientific thought. It represents a qualitatively new, superior stage in the development of philosophy.

Religious and mythological world outlook characteristic of the primitive society is known to be the first form of outlook historically. "Philosophy," Marx wrote, "first builds itself up within the religious form of consciousness, and in so doing on the one hand destroy religion as such, while on the other hand, in its positive content, it still moves only within this religious sphere, idealised and reduced to terms of thought."¹

The advent of slavery and growth of knowledge had as an inevitable consequence the decay of mythological consciousness. The emergence of philosophy is, essentially, a process whereby mythological consciousness yields to scientific and theoretical thinking, with a scientific world outlook emerging.

The philosophy of antiquity emerged as natural philosophy. It comprised all the knowledge of the world accumulated by the time, including that concerning man's immediate natural environment, celestial bodies, the human being, etc. "Among the Greeks ---," Engels wrote, "just because they were not yet advanced

1. Karl Marx, *Theories of Surplus-Value*, part I, Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1975, p. 52.

enough to dissect, analyse nature -- nature is still viewed as a whole, in general. The universal connection of natural phenomena is not proved in regard to particulars; to the Greeks it is the result of direct contemplation.¹ Philosophy includes all knowledge, becomes the science of everything, whose subject is the entire man's environment. The last philosopher to attempt to embrace all the knowledge available at the time was Aristotle (384-322 B.C.).

Over the fourth and third centuries B.C. scientific cognition of the world underwent significant changes. Under the influence of demands of social production, the need was increasingly arising for a more detailed study of individual phenomena and process: the position of stars had to be studied for sea navigation, geometry for measuring land plots, medicine developed as a result of the need for medical treatment, etc. Specific sciences were branching out of philosophy. The process was initially slow, then gained momentum. The compartmentalisation of science was most active in the 16th-18th centuries when it was caused by the development of capitalist production, the need for understanding different natural phenomena for their use in industry. Production needs served as an impetus for the emergence and development of mechanics, physics, chemistry, to be followed by biology, etc.

As individual specific sciences developed, the single approach to the world and nature characteristic of antique philosophy was lost, with each science dealing with its own laws, specific sets of phenomena in isolation from the other sciences. What was the role of philosophy under the circumstances?

Philosophy attempted somehow to preserve its dominant position in scientific knowledge and to establish relationships among different fields of knowledge. It became a kind of an encyclopaedia of human knowledge while laying claims to the role of the science of sciences. As such, philosophy undertook to be a substitute for specific sciences in the solution of difficult specific problems; in the process,

1. Frederick Engels, Dialectics of Nature, pp. 45-46.

instead of performing experiments or mathematical calculations, it approached the problems of natural science in a purely speculative manner, through logic.

Describing the philosophy of the 18th and early 19th centuries, Engels said that it put "in place of the real built as yet unknown interconnections ideal, fancied ones, filling in the missing facts by figments of the mind... . In the course of this procedure it conceived many brilliant ideas and foreshadowed many later discoveries but it also produced a considerable amount of nonsense...".¹ Among these brilliant ideas and forecasts were the atomistic hypothesis, the establishment of an interrelationship of electrical and magnetic phenomena, the formulation of the law of the conservation of matter and motion, etc.

As specific sciences developed, however, philosophy was increasingly losing relevance as a substitute for these sciences, and increasingly "producing nonsense". The science of sciences was losing ground under the pressure of specific sciences. The last philosopher to attempt to preserve philosophy as the science of sciences was Hegel.

In the 1830s and early 1840s, philosophy as the science of sciences finally lost its relevance. This was caused, besides the development of cognition itself and rapid progress of natural sciences, mostly by socio-economic changes. By the mid-19th century, capitalism was already established as a social system, with its progressiveness turning into conservatism and even reaction. Increasingly often bourgeois philosophers displayed a tendency to separate, and later to oppose science and world outlook to each other; they were not interested in the progress of world outlook, in seeing the world as constantly changing and developing. They claimed that there was development in science and virtually none in the field of world outlook. This doctrine in bourgeois philosophy is known as positivism.

1. Karl Marx, Frederick Engels, Selected Works in three volumes, Vol. 3, pp. 364-365.

As a philosophical doctrine, positivism contends that all genuine or "positive" knowledge can only be obtained from individual specific sciences and that philosophy as an independent science has no right to exist. Positivism was founded by Auguste Comte (1798-1857), the French philosopher, and British philosopher Herbert Spencer (1820-1903).

Since its emergence in the 1830s, positivism over its history underwent changes and exists in current bourgeois philosophy as empiriocriticism, logical positivism and analytical philosophy. Positivism, especially at its earlier stages, rejected the need for philosophy in scientific cognition. "Each science is a philosophy in itself, down with philosophy," the positivists said. Positivism is reactionary not only in that it rejects the need for theoretical generalisations, for the elaboration of a general theory, for the application of philosophical methods of cognition, thus delaying scientific cognition, but also in that it stands against the world outlook, against ideology and analysis of general laws of social development. Under the guise of rejecting the need for ideology, positivism stands for an ideology of passiveness and futility. Since its emergence, positivism has been directed against the class struggle of the proletariat.

Thus, positivism emerged at the time of the demise of philosophy as the science of sciences. On the other hand, under the influence of the unfolding struggle of the working class, of its needs, of its awareness of its historic mission, of the elaboration of objective laws of historical development, of outlining its historic purposes and tasks, Marxism was emerging. Marx and Engels led the philosophy out of the impasse it found itself in as the science of sciences, protected it from the destructive influence of positivism and found the real place and importance of philosophy within the system of scientific knowledge.

Among the elements of revolutionary changes in philosophy effected by Marx and Engels were an elaboration of the subject of philosophy and a study of the nature of those objective laws which form the real subject for philosophical study.

Objective laws are studied by all sciences. If philosophy was to be a science, rather than a futile mental exercise, it too had to study certain laws. Each science, mathematics, physics, chemistry, political economy, literary criticism, etc., has a certain limited set of laws to study. Mathematics, for one, is the science of the laws of quantitative relationships and spatial forms in the real world. Physics is the science of matter and the laws of physical processes. Biology is the science of the laws of live matter. Literary criticism is the science of the laws of literature as an artistic process and the historical processes of its development, etc. Each science has its own set of laws which changes historically as the science develops while always remaining specific, definite and relatively narrow. Each science, while influencing other sciences, is never a substitute for them in research. Thus, contemporary physics, studying the interaction of elementary particles and fields, does not analyse the process of life, which is the subject of biology; biology, in turn, does not interfere with physics, etc.

Nevertheless, in spite of the relatively isolated nature of physical, biological and social processes, they all have important common elements joining them together. They are all objective, cognisable by human consciousness and thinking, and thus are somehow related to this consciousness; they all experience changes and transformations and are thus subject to the laws of motion and development. In other words, all the diverse processes in the world, whose laws are studied by various specific sciences, have common properties, interrelationships, laws of motion and development. In short, besides the specific laws applied in relatively narrow spheres, laws of more general nature exist, applicable to all phenomena and processes. It is these laws that form the subject of philosophical study.

Thus, Marxist-Leninist philosophy is the science of the laws of the relation of consciousness to the objective world, of the more general laws of motion in nature, society and human thinking.

Specific and more general laws do not exist in isolation; on the contrary, they are closely interrelated, interwoven and mutually conditioned. It is for this reason that specific sciences and philosophy interact with each other.

Relationship of Knowledge in Philosophy and Natural Science

What is the nature of the relationship between Marxist-Leninist philosophy and specific sciences? This nature is a bilateral one.

On the one hand, in the elaboration of general laws philosophy utilises the developments in specific sciences, rebuilds them up and generalises the results of scientific research. The development of scientific cognition provides an increasing amount of material for philosophical generalisation. And, as Engels pointed out, "with each epoch-making discovery even in the sphere of natural science it (materialism--Ed.) has to change its form",¹ has to develop as scientific knowledge does. To be successful in philosophical activity, a philosopher must be profoundly knowledgeable and advanced culturally.

On the other hand, philosophy as the science of the most general laws of the world serves as the methodological and epistemological basis of scientific cognition. Most general knowledge offered by philosophy is the initial basis for the cognition of specific processes, a certain guide in the approach to the study of an unknown subject. A scientist knowledgeable in philosophy undertaking the study of the unknown would already know something about his subject since it conforms to the most general laws of motion.

The importance of philosophy in the scientific creative process was pointed out by great natural scientists. As Albert Einstein (1879-1955) noted, at present, a physicist has to deal with philosophical problems to a much greater extent than preceding generations of physicists had to. Physicists are

1. Karl Marx, Frederick Engels, Selected Works in three volumes, Vol. 3, p. 348.

forced to do so by the difficulties of their own science. A more elaborate definition of the place of philosophical problems in contemporary physics was given by Max Born (1882-1970), one of the founders of quantum mechanics. In his book Physics in My Generation's Life he writes, inter alia, "In the study of things in their entirety, a physicist at every step encounters logical and epistemological difficulties; and although the physicist deals only with a limited field of knowledge to the exclusion of such phenomena as life or consciousness, still the solution of these logical and epistemological problems represents the profound need of our quest for knowledge".²

Niels Bohr (1885-1962), the great 20th-century physicist, accorded major attention to work on the philosophical problem of science; his articles were published in the book Atomic Physics and Human Cognition. Work on philosophical problems by Werner Heisenberg (1901-1976), another founder of modern physics, was reflected in his book Philosophical Problems of Modern Atomic Physics. The list of examples could be continued - they all demonstrate that scientific philosophy is an integral part of scientific cognition of the world, an essential element of scientific development.

The scientists who adhere to positivism, reject the importance of philosophy for scientific cognition and are doing harm primarily to science itself, as they limit its possibilities. With reference to such scientists, F. Engels said, "Natural scientists may adopt whatever attitude they please, they are still under the domination of philosophy. It is only a question whether they want to be dominated by a bad, fashionable philosophy or by a form of theoretical thought which rests on acquaintance with the history of thought and its achievements."³

-
1. A. Einstein, Collection of Scientific Works, Vol. 4, Nauka Publishers, Moscow, 1967, p. 248 (Russ. ed.).
 2. M. Born, "Fizika v zhizni moego pokoleniya". Inostrannaya Literature Publishers, Moscow, 1963, p. 78 (Russ. ed.).
 3. Frederick Engels, Dialectics of Nature, p. 210.

Marxist-Leninist philosophy dialectical and historical materialism became the philosophical basis for the most fruitful development of specific sciences. That is due to the fact that this philosophy reveals the dialectical character of nature and of society, elaborates subjective dialectics, i.e. the dialectics of mental processes, studies the most general laws of nature, society and thought, finds the ways for the penetration of human thought into the essence of objective reality.

Marxist philosophy is creative, it continuously develops and improves, acquiring new content. Its development takes place primarily together and in close connection with the development of other sciences, within a single system of cognition of the world by man.

Further, not only does Marxist philosophy develop on the basis of other sciences by generalising their achievements; it also progresses on its own, by improving its set of categories, discovering new connections and relations between concepts, analysing mental processes, etc.

Social progress in all its manifestations is one of the basic sources and moving forces of the development of Marxist philosophical knowledge. Social life — the production of material goods, intellectual activities, social relations, class struggle, the state and political system, etc. — develop continuously, providing new material for comprehensive philosophical analysis, for further development of philosophy. The development of Marxist-Leninist philosophy is based primarily on the unfolding of the world revolutionary process — the building of socialism and communism, the class struggle of the working people in capitalist countries, national liberation revolutions, and the struggle for national, economic and political independence of peoples.

Marx and Engels worked on their philosophy, in the course of more than half a century, in close relation with all the social phenomena of their time.

It is with the activities of V.I. Lenin in the historical setting of the 20th century that the next stage in the development of Marxist philosophy is linked.

3. The Leninist Stage in the Development of Marxist Philosophy

Historical Background
of the Leninist Stage

In the late 1800s, capitalism
entered the highest stage of
its historical development,

the stage of imperialism.

The imperialist stage is characterised by a further development of productive forces, by a concentration of production and capital in the hands of monopolistic associations, by a sharp deterioration of contradictions between the social nature of production and the capitalist form of appropriation. With the advent of imperialism, a real possibility arises of a revolutionary transformation of capitalist society into a socialist one, albeit in one country at the initial stage.

At the turn of the 20th century, the centre of the world revolutionary movement moved from Western Europe to Russia. The working class of Russia, led by the party of Leninist type, succeeded in establishing its hegemony in bourgeois-democratic revolution, completed it and led the struggle of the working masses for a socialist revolution. The age of social upheavals and revolutions began. The new historical situation gave rise to a vital need for a creative development of Marxist world outlook, for enriching it theoretically, reflecting, by means of generalisation, the laws and distinguishing features of imperialism and of the class struggle of international proletariat. The decisive role in the solution of this historical task was played by V.I. Lenin.

"Leninism is the new, highest stage of Marxism, its creative development under new historical conditions, under the conditions of imperialism and proletarian revolutions, of mankind's transition from capitalism towards socialism and communism... . The Leninist stage in the development of revolutionary theory is the Marxism of the 20th century, the Marxism of the current age."¹

-
1. Founders of Scientific Communism. Theses on the 150th birth anniversary of Karl Marx, Moscow, 1968, pp. 15-16 (in Russian).

The historic role of Lenin as a thinker and philosopher consists in his development of Marxist theory by means of a scientific analysis and generalisation of fundamental processes in science and within the capitalist social formation of the late 19th and early 20th centuries.

Lenin's contribution of world historic importance also consisted in his defence of the revolutionary essence of Marxist theory in a consistent struggle against social democratic reformism and various manifestations of right-wing and "left"-wing revisionism.

A strictly scientific approach to the solution of social and theoretical problems is characteristic of Leninism. If in the age of Marx and Engels many tasks could only be formulated in a general, theoretical form, they acquired a practical meaning and relevance for the first time in the age of Leninism.

Historical experience has demonstrated that Lenin's theory of socialist revolution was correct and the dialectical materialist conception of the communist formation development viable.

A Revolution in Natural
Science and the Develop-
ment of Marxist Philosophy
by Lenin

The onset of the Leninist stage in the development of Marxist philosophy is also linked to the revolution in natural science which took place in the late 19th and

early 20th century and had an enormous philosophical importance, since it provided a more profound scientific view of the world and confirmed that the dialectical materialist conception of Marxism was correct.

"The latest discoveries of natural science -- radium, electrons, the transmutation of elements," Lenin wrote, "have been a remarkable confirmation of Marx's dialectical materialism... ."¹

1. V.I. Lenin, Collected Works, Vol. 19, p. 24

At the same time, a contradiction emerged between the dialectical nature of phenomena discovered by physics, and the metaphysical approach to matter and its attributes. It became the basis of "physical idealism" of the early 20th century.

"The essence of crisis in modern physics," Lenin wrote, "consists in the break-down of the old laws and basic principles, in the rejection of an objective reality existing outside the mind, that is, in the replacement of materialism by idealism and agnosticism."¹

In a philosophical generalisation of latest discoveries in natural science, Lenin revealed the epistemological causes of the crisis in physics while elaborating the methodological means of overcoming it.

Lenin's justification of the need for application by physicists of a dialectical materialist method of thinking was accompanied by his denunciation of attempts by idealists to capitalise on the difficulties encountered by the current physics in its development. Lenin's struggle with the proponents of "physical idealism" was concerned mainly with the problems, of matter, motion, time, space, causality, etc.

If Marxist philosophy was to be defended against its theoretical opponents, an answer was needed to questions posed by the development of scientific cognition and social life. Lenin's Materialism and Empirio-Criticism was the philosophical work to solve the new theoretical problems and to contain a devastating criticism of "latest" anti-Marxist philosophical concepts.

V.I. Lenin's Philosophical Notebooks, although not completed, belong among the most outstanding works of Marxist philosophical thought.

Lenin's philosophical notebooks represent a further comprehensive development of Marxist dialectics. It involved the elaboration of doctrines on:

1. V.I. Lenin, Collected Works, Vol. 14, p. 258

- 1) the unity and conflict of opposites as the nucleus and essence of dialectics;
- 2) dialectics as a system of inter-related elements;
- 3) categories of dialectics as the logical generalisation of man's practice, the sum total of the development of the history of cognition;
- 4) unity of dialectics, logics and the theory of knowledge;
- 5) the character and role of contradictions within the systems of social relations under capitalism and under socialism.

V.I. Lenin elaborated and developed the brilliant ideas of the founders of Marxist philosophy concerning the role of practice in the theory of knowledge as the decisive means of verifying the genuineness of man's knowledge. "The standpoint of life, of practice, should be first and fundamental in the theory of knowledge."¹

In an elaboration of Marx's doctrine of cognition, Lenin developed the doctrine of reflection. For the first time in Marxist literature, Lenin formulated a provision concerning a leap in the evolution of forms of reflection.

Obviously, Lenin's contribution to Marxist dialectics, scientific methodology of cognition and revolutionary practice is not limited to these significant aspects.

The imperialist epoch has introduced a number of changes in the economics and politics of capitalism, in the correlation of classes and forms of their struggle, and accelerated the liberation movement of the peoples of colonial and dependent countries. To give correct guidance to the proletariat and its revolutionary party in the solution of the problems they faced, a scientific explanation of distinctive features of the new historical situation was required. Lenin carried out this task successfully by applying materialist dialectics to a study of imperialism, thus developing historical materialism further.

Lenin consistently upheld the Marxist provision whereby historical materialism is an application of principles and

I. V.I. Lenin, Collected works, Vol. 14, p. 142.

At the same time, a contradiction emerged between the dialectical nature of phenomena discovered by physics, and the metaphysical approach to matter and its attributes. It became the basis of "physical idealism" of the early 20th century.

"The essence of crisis in modern physics," Lenin wrote, "consists in the break-down of the old laws and basic principles, in the rejection of an objective reality existing outside the mind, that is, in the replacement of materialism by idealism and agnosticism."¹

In a philosophical generalisation of latest discoveries in natural science, Lenin revealed the epistemological causes of the crisis in physics while elaborating the methodological means of overcoming it.

Lenin's justification of the need for application by physicists of a dialectical materialist method of thinking was accompanied by his denunciation of attempts by idealists to capitalise on the difficulties encountered by the current physics in its development. Lenin's struggle with the proponents of "physical idealism" was concerned mainly with the problems, of matter, motion, time, space, causality, etc.

If Marxist philosophy was to be defended against its theoretical opponents, an answer was needed to questions posed by the development of scientific cognition and social life. Lenin's Materialism and Empirio-Criticism was the philosophical work to solve the new theoretical problems and to contain a devastating criticism of "latest" anti-Marxist philosophical concepts.

V.I. Lenin's Philosophical Notebooks, although not completed, belong among the most outstanding works of Marxist philosophical thought.

Lenin's philosophical notebooks represent a further comprehensive development of Marxist dialectics. It involved the elaboration of doctrines on:

1. V.I. Lenin, Collected Works, Vol. 14, p. 258

- 1) the unity and conflict of opposites as the nucleus and essence of dialectics;
- 2) dialectics as a system of inter-related elements;
- 3) categories of dialectics as the logical generalisation of man's practice, the sum total of the development of the history of cognition;
- 4) unity of dialectics, logics and the theory of knowledge;
- 5) the character and role of contradictions within the systems of social relations under capitalism and under socialism.

V.I. Lenin elaborated and developed the brilliant ideas of the founders of Marxist philosophy concerning the role of practice in the theory of knowledge as the decisive means of verifying the genuineness of man's knowledge. "The standpoint of life, of practice, should be first and fundamental in the theory of knowledge."¹

In an elaboration of Marx's doctrine of cognition, Lenin developed the doctrine of reflection. For the first time in Marxist literature, Lenin formulated a provision concerning a leap in the evolution of forms of reflection.

Obviously, Lenin's contribution to Marxist dialectics, scientific methodology of cognition and revolutionary practice is not limited to these significant aspects.

The imperialist epoch has introduced a number of changes in the economics and politics of capitalism, in the correlation of classes and forms of their struggle, and accelerated the liberation movement of the peoples of colonial and dependent countries. To give correct guidance to the proletariat and its revolutionary party in the solution of the problems they faced, a scientific explanation of distinctive features of the new historical situation was required. Lenin carried out this task successfully by applying materialist dialectics to a study of imperialism, thus developing historical materialism further.

Lenin consistently upheld the Marxist provision whereby historical materialism is an application of principles and

¹. V.I. Lenin, Collected works, Vol. 14, p. 142.

categories of dialectical materialism to the cognition of social phenomena. Thus Lenin regarded historical materialism as a method making possible the use of cognition of the laws of existence and of the functioning of capitalism to effect its revolutionary transformation into socialism.

Lenin's sociological works contain a profound analysis of the relationship between social being and social consciousness in capitalist society and the special role played by progressive ideas in the struggle for a radical change in capitalist social relations.

Lenin developed Marx's concept of man as a subject cognising the world and transforming reality. In the process of transforming reality, man changes himself, acquires an outlook which reflects social relations. To determine specific historical types of the relations, Marxism worked out the socio-economic relations, and the causes of existence of the ideological superstructure. At the imperialist stage of development, Lenin made this theory more specific.

"Marxism," Lenin wrote, "indicated the way to an all-embracing and comprehensive study of the process of the rise, development, and decline of socio-economic systems."¹

A social formation is based on a certain level of development of productive forces and on their nature. The mechanism of emergence and change of formations is as follows: "In acquiring new productive forces men change their mode of production; and in changing their mode of production, in changing the way of earning their living, they change all their social relations."² A change of social relations, rooted in the degree of development of material production, represents a move from one formation to another.

Lenin stressed that the Marxist theory of socio-economic formations was a methodological means for revealing the dialectics of the historical process. The nature of classes,

1. V.I. Lenin, Collected Works, Vol. 21, p. 57.

2. Karl Marx, Frederich Engels, Collected Works, Vol. 6, Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1976, p. 166.

their relations and struggle, their relation to state, politics, religion, the level of scientific development, etc., which are specific for each formation, all determine the content and the form of spiritual life at each stage.

Marxist-Leninist theory of socio-economic formations is a reflection of unity of the general and the specific in the development of peoples, of continuity and discontinuity of the historical process, which traces the guiding line of mankind's development and the basic qualitatively differing stages of the historical process. This theory offers the key to the explanation of any specific social phenomenon or process in terms of their emergence, development and historical perspective, in their historical continuity.

The Unity of Dialectical and Historical Materialism

Lenin described dialectical materialism as the philosophical basis of Marxism, the philosophy of Marxism, implying,

as a matter of course, that historical materialism was an organic part of dialectical materialism.

Historical materialism, as an organic component part of dialectical materialism, can be treated only as a relatively independent scientific discipline.

Engels and Lenin isolated historical materialism on purpose, as a rule, to stress the new elements introduced by Marxism in social science.

Lenin, placing historical materialism in the framework of Marx's integral philosophical theory as complete philosophical materialism, still pointed out the special role of historical materialism. Marx's "historical materialism," Lenin wrote, "was a great achievement in scientific thinking. The chaos and arbitrariness that had previously reigned in views on history and politics were replaced by a strikingly integral and harmonious scientific theory, which shows how, in consequence of the growth of productive forces, out of one system of social life another and higher system develops -- how capitalism, for instance, grows out of feudalism."¹

¹. V.I. Lenin, Collected Works, Vol. 19, p. 25.

The monism of Marxist philosophy lies in a consistent application of the principle of materialism to the study of nature, society and thinking. The organic interrelationship of nature, society and thinking is reflected in Marxist philosophy as a mutual penetration of categories of dialectical and historical materialism. Marxist philosophy put an end to isolated treatment of basic spheres of being and consciousness, revealed the interrelationship between the unity of these spheres. It is for this reason that the study of dialectical and historical materialism is based on a single set of categories and a single philosophical nucleus.

It was philosophical monism that became the key used to the enigma of humanity's spiritual life, including the secret of philosophy itself.

The chaos reigning supreme in the approach to spiritual life and spiritual phenomena was replaced by a strikingly harmonious theory demonstrating that political and intellectual history of any age reflected its economic history.

At the same time, the essence and role of all the basic spiritual phenomena were defined, and a determined, law-governed relationship was established between them and their economic basis, and besides that, between themselves. This should be credited to historical materialism.

The nature of philosophy itself and the nature of dialectical materialism are only comprehensible within the framework of historical materialism, this being the most fundamental proof of validity of the principle of unity of dialectical and historical materialism, of monism of Marxist philosophy.

Lenin pointed out that the application of materialist philosophy to history and social science, and the very idea of materialism in sociology, were brilliant undertakings.

Not only does historical materialism reveal that social consciousness is determined by social being and by the economic system of a society; it reveals the laws of their interaction, of the nature of the relationship of individual forms of social consciousness with the society's economic system.

Politics and law, for example, are most closely linked to the economic system, being a direct and immediate reflection of the interests of classes of the system. On the other

hand, Engels described religion and philosophy as ideologies "of a higher order", soaring higher above the rest of them and most detached from the economic system, reflecting it less directly while being, in particular, under the direct and immediate influence of politics.

A study of the basic principle of historical materialism, then, also means revealing some specifics of philosophy as a social phenomenon, with the specifics understandable only in the context of the laws of emergence, functioning and development of social consciousness as a whole.

The theoretical revolution in philosophy - the elaboration of dialectical and historical materialism - meant a radical change of the very essence of philosophy, overcoming the metaphysical opposition of philosophy to natural science and practical activity. Dialectical and historical materialism form a single philosophical doctrine which serves simultaneously as the theory of general laws of existence, as the theory of knowledge, and as the theory of a universal method for cognising and transforming objective reality.

Since its emergence, the philosophy of Marxism has been a creative, developing system of philosophical knowledge. The philosophy of Marxism has become a great spiritual force for the progress of all humanity.

Chapter I

MATTER AND CONSCIOUSNESS

A materialistic solution of the basic question of philosophy is not limited to proving that matter is primary and consciousness secondary; it implies a definition of what is to be considered material and what is deemed spiritual, a study of the essence of both, a comprehensive justification of the materialist idea of the relationship of consciousness to being and of the spiritual to the material.

A dialectical materialist analysis of these problems represents the basic premise and the most important part of the content of Marxist-Leninist philosophy. It is this analysis that is dealt with in Chapter I.

1. Matter and Forms of Its Existence

Materialism vs. Idealism

We observe an endless variety of objects, phenomena and processes, possessing most diverse properties, in the world surrounding us. What do all the objects and processes represent, what is their basis? Questions like these already arose in ancient times; they became the subject of special attention at the time of emergence of philosophy. Differing answers were offered by various doctrines, of both materialist and idealistic tendencies.

According to idealist philosophers, some ideal substance (the essence, the fundamental principle) was the basis of all the world's objects and phenomena, like the divine will, universal reason, absolute idea, spirit, etc; or else, the objects were regarded as a derivative of the inner spiritual world of man -- his sensations, perceptions, reason.

At first glance it might seem that this answers the question of the world's origins. The question always arises, however: what is this universal reason, idea, spirit, or human sensations, human reason, etc? What is their basis? What causes their existence? Another, more profound prime basis could be invented, but the same questions would logically apply to

it as well. Clearly, this would lead to an absurd situation, to an endless variety of proposed prime bases.

Already in very ancient times, materialist philosophy, studying the question of the essence of the world, came to the conclusion that the world had not been created by anyone, neither by gods nor by men, but had been in existence eternally, merely moving from one state to another; things, phenomena, processes emerge and cease to exist, but the world itself never disappears. If the world exists, it cannot cease to exist; likewise, how could it not have existed if it exists now? Otherwise questions always arise to which there is no answer: whereto did the world disappear and whence it came.

The idea that the world came into existence at sometime, or could have in principle, and that the world might in principle cease to exist, was formed and supported through the observation of existence of individual things, objects, and phenomena. Men have always witnessed something or other (e.g., a man, a tree, an animal, a house) come into existence, exist, and disappear. However, what is true for individual things is not true for the world as a whole, since neither the human body nor the tree disappear absolutely, they just move from a living state into a non-living one, become a substance which then forms a part of other things, processes and phenomena.

It was this eternal substance, the material which constitutes all objects, phenomena, processes and into which they are transformed again, to emerge from it anew, in another form, that was called matter, i.e. the essence, the underlying basis.

An understanding of matter is the basic element of materialist philosophy, always the subject of major attention of philosophers of the materialist school.

In the process of historical development of philosophical thought, two basic approaches to the explanation of matter emerged. In approximate terms, they could be described as: (1) the explanation of matter from the standpoint of its structure, and (2) the explanation of matter in terms of solution of the basic question of philosophy. Both approaches always existed in one variation or another; the former, however,

was popular in the earlier period of the development of philosophy, when philosophy represented undivided knowledge. The latter is characteristic of the New Age, the period when specific sciences which had branched out of philosophy, were developing significantly and undertook a detailed study of both the structure of matter and of its elements. Under those circumstances, philosophy concentrated on explaining the essence of matter, its relation to consciousness, on ascertaining what its attributes are, etc.

Theories of Matter in the Philosophy of the Ancient East

Ancient Egypt and Sumer.

Myths and traditions of the period reflect a division of the world into "sky" and "earth", the earth considered a voluminous mass floating on water. "Water" was considered to be the basis of all being. The latter idea had an enormous influence on entire ancient philosophy. According to ancient sources, Thales, one of Ancient Greece's first philosophers, "learned from the Egyptians to regard water as the primal matter or principal of all things."

In Ancient India, theories on matter were developed further.

Materialistic schools of Indian philosophy presumed that all being was based on prakriti or pradhana - the primal basis of material world in its entirety, characterised by omnipresence and unity. Prakriti, however, is not a matter in the form in which the world is perceived. It has neither beginning nor end, is caused by no supreme reason, and cannot be created or destroyed. The emergence of a single object does not mean creation, while annihilation is not related to the destruction of prakriti. Motion is as eternal as matter is. Motion and change are a property of matter. The entire diversity of phenomena is based on matter (prakriti, pradhana), atoms (anu), the material principle (bhuta). Since pradhana is not produced of anything, it can be a product of nothing.

The materialistic school of Indian philosophy, Lokayata, holds that the Universe and all things existing therein were born of themselves, without interference by any extraneous force. Four elements, earth, water, fire and air, are eternal and form the prime basis of all things existing. Complicated life forms, rather than emerging all at once, evolve from primitive ones over a long period of time. Consciousness is held to be a quality inherent in man only and representing a special combination of material elements. Reality is a single, though complicated whole, composed of material elements. The material world exists objectively, yet its existence is independent of the source of knowledge. An unlimited quantity of impenetrable and indivisible atoms exists in nature. Since all matter is composed of the four elements, all the atoms are divided into four categories.

The reality of existence of the surrounding world is accepted by a number of other schools of Indian philosophy. Thus, one of the basic schools of Buddhist philosophy, Hinayana, accepts that all things perceived by the senses exist in reality, in time and space, and that reason like other things, is finite. Hinayana accepts the existence of a primal and unalterable substance, composed of five scands, or elements, which can adopt various temporary forms. The elements are composed of atoms having the same qualitative properties. Man, however, is able to perceive only groups, or masses of atoms, since an atom is invisible, indivisible, and imperceptible. Jainist philosophy holds that the world is composed of homogeneous atoms. The Nyaya-Vaisesika system contends that the world exists objectively and is composed of heterogeneous atoms subject to the law of causality, which is in turn subject to the law of Karma. Mimansa also accepts the real existence of the objective world, composed of atoms, guided by the law of Karma. The Sankhya holds that the world existing in reality is the result of practice having three qualities: sattva - harmonious balance (light, sparkle, joy), rajas - activity (movement, excitement, suffering), and tamas - inertia (weight, momentum). Prakriti represents matter wherein all the three qualities are in balance, which leads to the development of the Universe. No one, however,

can say what disrupts the balance.

Consciousness originates in the process of the establishment of balance of prakriti, while the spiritual principle plays no limited role in the development of matter. Idealistic schools use the concept of Maya to eliminate the contradiction they arrive at by declaring that matter is a part of God, i.e., spiritual substance. Maya is considered to be a unique, miraculous, inexplicable and divine force of genuine creation, isolating the material substance, which becomes part of the real world, from the spiritual one. In subjective idealistic schools of Indian philosophy, the identification of the object and the subject has led to a rejection of the objects' existence, to a view of world as a combination of dharmaas, or elements, which exist instantaneously.

The materialist philosophy of ancient Indis had an enormous influence on the development of philosophical thinking of peoples of the East antiquity and European countries.

Ancient Chinese philosophers, already in the early 1 millennium B.C. also developed a materialist theory of the world, pointing out its prime elements, like metal, wood, water, fire and earth. The Taoist school of the 4th-3rd centuries B.C. developed a doctrine on Tao, the most profound basis of all things. Taoism contained some elements of spontaneous dialectics, as it was considered that nothing was permanent, with everything moving and changing.

Philosophy in Ancient Greece

Materialist philosophy in
Ancient Greece enormously influenced the development of world philosophical thinking.

Thales (610-546 B.C.), the founder of ancient materialist philosophy, contended that everything came from water and returned back into water.

A further step in the development of materialism was made by Anaximander (c. 610-546 B.C.), who described a single and eternal prime basis of natural phenomena as apeiron, an indeterminate and unlimited matter. According to ancient sources, "Anaximander, friend of Thales, held that the Unlimited is every reason for universal creation and destruction. It is from it, he says, that the skies, and all other worlds,

unlimited in number, separated out. He declared that they cease to exist after the expiration of a very long period after their emergence, all succeeding one another since times immemorial."

Anaximenes (c. 585-525 B.C.), Thales' second disciple, explained the eternal succession of phenomena as condensation and rarefaction of prime matter - air. Through condensation it changes into wind, to be followed by cloud, water, earth and stone, and through rarefaction it transforms into fire.

Heraclitus (c. 530-470 B.C.), an eminent materialist and dialectician of Ancient Greece, held that fire was the primal matter of all natural phenomena. "This one order of all things was created by none of the gods, nor yet by any of mankind," Heraclitus said, "but it ever was, and is, and shall be eternal fire." The world, like fire, is always moving and always changing. V.I. Lenin described Heraclitus as one of the founders of dialectics.¹

Theories of Democritus (c. 460-370 B.C.), an ancient Greek materialist, became the pinnacle of ancient philosophy in its study of the composition of matter. He was described by Marx and Engels as "the first encyclopaedic mind among the Greeks."² According to Democritus, the Universe was composed of basic indivisible elements which he called atoms (from Greek atomos, indivisible). Differences between the atoms were due to their various shapes, positions, and arrangement. Besides the atoms, a void exists for them to move in. Atoms are naturally endowed with motion. In the process, they establish various relationships with one another to form all kinds of objects, perceived by man. Opposing idealism and religion, Democritus held that the entire universe consisted of atoms, including the soul, which he claimed comprised "subtle" and "tender" atoms. Democritus proposed a single materialist world outlook thus becoming, according to V.I. Lenin, the founder of the materialist trend in the history of development of philosophy.

1. See V.I. Lenin, Collected Works, Vol. 38, p. 346.

2. K. Marx, F. Engels, Collected Works, Vol. 5, Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1976, p. 140.

An important contribution to the development of theories of matter was made by Aristotle (384-322 B.C.). He regarded matter as some kind of a raw material, out of which form created individual perceptible things. "Matter is one," Aristotle said, "form is another, the one is given in possibility, the other in reality."¹

While Aristotle's contribution to the development of theories on matter should be singled out, attention should also be drawn to the fact that he overestimated the importance of form, seeing it as a certain independent immaterial force born out of entelechy, the form of all forms. It was at this point that Aristotle approached an idealistic position, a deficiency in his philosophy. This Aristotle's approach to entelechy as the non-material prime basis of all things was what European scholasticism of the Middle Ages used to serve the purposes of religion.

Outstanding contributions to the theory of matter were also made by the Greek materialist philosopher Epicurus (341-270 B.C.) and Lucretius Carus (c. 99-55 B.C.), an eminent thinker of Ancient Rome, and others.

The question of origins and development of philosophical thinking of ancient peoples in other continents, in particular Latin America, plays an important role in the history of world philosophy. Data available to modern science serve to refute false Eurocentric and racialist views concerning the alleged "philosophical inferiority" of these peoples, or concerning the exclusive predominance of religious and mythological beliefs in their pre-colonial culture. Like with the peoples of ancient East, Greece and Rome at the age of slave ownership, the philosophical thinking of pre-colonial cultures of the peoples of Latin American originated in connection with the application of a single universal law -- the separation of intellectual and physical labour, and the division of production into material and spiritual.

Originally, philosophy was a form of comprehension not

1. Aristotle, *Metafizika*, Moscow-Leningrad, 1976, Vol. 1, p. 232 (Russ. ed.).

only of empirical knowledge accumulated by man in the process of practical activity, but also of his religious beliefs.

"Philosophy," Marx pointed out, "first builds itself up within the religious form of consciousness, and in so doing on the one hand destroys religion as such, while on the other hand, in its positive content, it still moves only within this religious sphere, idealised and reduced to terms of thought."¹

The above is true, for example, for the ancient Inca society, where the norms of primitive customs, art and religion were combined with the norms of approaching life, politics, law, ethics, and art, characteristic of the initial stage of the slave ownership system. It is under the developing slave ownership society that philosophy, as a form of social consciousness, acquired more possibilities for development.

In the mythological system of ancient peoples of the early class society in Mesoamerica, the Scythe Goddess was the supreme universal being, combining early mythological views on spirit of plants and animals with those of the sky, earth, time, life and death. The multifaceted nature of the image allowed its further differentiation, increasingly narrowing its functions. This tendency is also evident in mythological formations of the Chavin culture with origins in the latter half of the second millennium B.C. They contained a number of cosmological concepts explaining the Universe and its development through a series of images of fantastic creatures, whose common feature was their existence on Earth. Views on other space, motion, time, space and life, developing within mythology, were playing a cognitive role which was more important than the mythological figures proper.

After the fall of the civilisation of Ancient East and the Roman Empire and the decomposition of the system of ownership, while the struggle of materialism and idealism in philosophy continued, philosophical thought was nevertheless subordinate to the church and religion. Church dogma became the premise and the basis of all thinking. Religion was the

1. Karl Marx, Theories of Surplus-Value, Part I, Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1975, p. 52.

predominant form of ideology in feudal society; thus, natural science, social science and philosophy in their entirety were brought in accordance with the church doctrine.

Arab Philosophy

In spite of the church oppression and the religious form, scientific cognition and philosophy never ceased development. In the Middle Ages, in the late first and early second millennia A.D., scientific and philosophical thought reached a high level of development in countries of the Arab East.

Relying on the heritage of earlier civilisations, Indian, Chinese, Greek and Roman, the thinkers of Arabia continued to develop the philosophical approach to the world and its structure.

Within Arab philosophy of the Middle Ages, which made a significant contribution to the development of world philosophical thought, an acute struggle was taking place between materialism and idealism. Materialist views, according to which natural phenomena developed in conformity with their laws and had a cause-and-effect relationship, were held by the prominent representative of Eastern Aristotelianism al-Kindi (809-879). The Muslim orthodoxy accused him of heresy and condemned his books to burning; it is for this reason that only excerpts from his works survived until the present time. Ibn Rushd, a prominent thinker of the Middle Ages who elaborated on the materialistic aspects of Aristotle's system, rejected the religious dogmas that god created world "out of nothing". He held that matter was the unique basis of being; in his philosophy the matter represented an eternal and universal source of motion. Ibn Rushd was one of the founders of the theory on "duality of truth" which was to gain wide acceptance among European philosophers subsequently. In accordance with the theory, the truth of philosophy is not in contradiction with the truth of religion, since they apply to differing areas, with religion instructing man as to how one should act and philosophy pursuing absolute truth. Materialistic elements in Ibn Rushd's philosophy, however, coexist with idealism; he held that the "ultimate cause" of being was deity which, in his words, was "the thought thinking itself."

A combination of materialist tendencies and theological and religious views characterises philosophical theories of al-Farabi, al-Biruni (c. 973-1048), and Ibn-Sina (c. 980-1037), among other outstanding thinkers of the Middle Ages. al-Farabi, for instance, saw God as the prime cause of being while looking upon the universe as existing in its own right, independently of supernatural forces. Ibn-Sina accepted the objective existence of nature; in spite of their religious and theological appearance, his theory of emanation and his idea on the eternal nature of the material world were in contradiction with the religious dogma.

One of the most prominent materialists in the history of philosophy of the Middle Ages was Ibn-Khaldun, who made the first attempt to approach the question of influence of material life on social development.

An analysis of the development of Arabian philosophy over the Middle Ages leads to the conclusion that it was based primarily on the struggle between the materialist and idealist tendencies, which is characteristic of the world history of philosophy in general.

Arabian scientific and progressive philosophical thought of the Middle Ages had an enormous influence on the development of philosophy in the entire world, and especially in Europe where, under the influence of the nascent capitalist relations, a renaissance was taking place in the development of arts, sciences, and philosophy. As science, technology and social production advanced, creative materialist thinking was developed by European scientists, for whom a study of the structure and composition of matter was a subject of major attention.

Development of Philosophy in the Age of the Renaissance and Bourgeois Revolutions

strial bodies was made by Nicolaus Copernicus (1473-1543), Giordano Bruno (1548-1600), Johannes Kepler (1571-1630), Galileo Galilei (1564-1642), among other great scientists.

An outstanding contribution to the evolution of a scientific understanding of the structure of the solar system and the movement of celestial bodies was made by Nicolaus Copernicus (1473-1543), Giordano Bruno (1548-1600), Johannes Kepler (1571-1630), Galileo Galilei (1564-1642), among other great scientists.

Their scientific studies revived and developed further the atomistic theories of early Greek philosophers.

If capitalist production was to be developed, progress in science, technology and creative thought was required. The nascent bourgeoisie was engaged in a struggle against feudalism and, by the same token, against religious ideology. Thus, prerequisites were being created for a broad development of materialistic thought. In the late 16th century, England became one of the most important centres of developing science and materialist philosophy. British materialism and all modern experimenting sciences were founded by Francis Bacon. Francis Bacon (1561-1626) concentrated on the elaboration of a scientific method of cognition; yet, his contribution to theories concerning matter was not an insignificant one. He pointed out the unity of matter and motion, while stressing the multitude of forms of motion of matter. "In Bacon," Marx wrote, "its first creator, materialism still holds back within itself in a naive way the germs of a many-sided development. On the one hand, matter, surrounded by a sensuous, poetic glamour, sums to attract man's whole entity by winning smiles."¹

Thomas Hobbes (1588-1679), another British philosopher, attempted to approach matter and the forms of its existence not only from the viewpoint of its structure but, to a significant degree, from the point of view of the solution of the basic question of philosophy. He held that matter in the form of any object existing objectively should be distinguished from the subjective "image of matter", space as objective dimensions of objects from the subjective "image of space", and time as movement of an object from the "image of time". The surmised incomplete coincidence of the subjective image and the object was the philosopher's important achievement.

An enormous contribution to the development of mathematics, physics, and especially philosophy, was made by great French philosopher Rene Descartes (1596-1650). Matter exists objectively, he taught, and is composed of particles which are theoretically infinitely divisible and exist in a perman-

1. K. Marx, F. Engels, Collected Works, Vol. 4, p. 128.

ent mechanical movement. Matter and movement are indestructable.

Philosophers' theories on the versatility of forms of matter and on the particles whereof it is composed of necessity led to the question of the unity in this diversity. Benedict de Spinoza (1632-1677), a prominent Dutch materialist thinker, gave much attention to the question. In Spinoza's philosophy, the concept that all nature is unified and law-governed was expressed in the notion of substance. Substance is the material basis comprising the unity of all things. It is unlimited in time and space. Substance is the prime cause of all being; it does not require a creator and is self-existent (causa sui). According to Spinoza, substance is one; it exists in different states or "modes".

Descartes also accepted substance as the basis of the Universe; his doctrine, however, held that the basis was two-fold, both material and spiritual, which made Descartes a dualist.

Materialist philosophy was further developed by the French materialists of the 18th century, Lamettrie (1709-1751), Diderot (1713-1784), Helvetius (1715-1771), and Holbach (1723-1789). The French materialists' common approach to matter was described by Holbach in his book The System of Nature (Le systeme de la nature). It was a further elaboration of the approach to matter from the standpoint of the basic question of philosophy. Holbach defines matter as "all that influences our senses in any matter".¹ The mention of recognisability of matter, of it being perceptible by the human senses, is an important positive aspect of the definition. It was this element of the theory of matter that was aimed against agnosticism, the theory that matter is not cognisable by the senses. This was of major importance in the methodological justification of sciences aimed at cognising the material world. The definition of matter offered by Holbach, however, also had the deficiency of not stressing that matter exists objectively, independently of human senses.

1. P. Holbach, Sistema prirody, (The system of Nature), Moscow, 1940, p. 25 (Russ. ed.).

Naturally, like the other French materialists, Holbach repeatedly affirmed that matter existed objectively. He failed, however, to stress the objective existence of matter in this definition, thus weakening his position in the struggle against subjective idealism. The definition also influenced the philosophical outlook of Feuerbach, who approached nature as something material, existing outside human consciousness and capable of being perceived by the senses. Feuerbach was able, to a degree, to overcome the mechanistic and abstract nature of the 17th-18th century theories on nature and stressed its diversity.

Ideas that the Universe was material were widespread among pre-Marxian materialist philosophers. A definition of matter offered by the Russian materialist Nikolai Chernyshevsky (1828-1889) was also in use through the pre-Marxian period. In his The Anthropological Principle in Philosophy he wrote, "Matter is what exists. Matter possesses qualities. Forces are manifestations of qualities. What we call natural laws are modes of operation of the forces."¹ As we see, Chernyshevsky, as distinct from Holbach, stresses the objective nature of matter. This was of major importance in the struggle against subjective idealism, which was an attempt to prove that the universe is the motion of our sensations, thoughts and experiences. The definition of matter offered by Chernyshevsky was also aimed against objective idealism and its claims that various changes in the world and the laws in effect in nature were manifestations of some absolute idea, spirit, or god. Chernyshevsky, on the other hand, stressed the material character of natural laws.

It should be pointed out, nevertheless, that Chernyshevsky's definition fails to stress that objectively existing matter is cognisable by man and reflected by the senses; in

1. N.G. Chernyshevsky, Works, Vol. 14, Moscow, 1950, p. 675, (in Russian).

other words, the definition does not reflect the second aspect of the basic question of philosophy, that of whether the world is cognisable Chernyshevsky undoubtedly recognised the cognisability of the world and was engaged in a struggle against agnosticism in general, and against Kant in particular. Yet, an insufficiently clear mention of cognisability of matter in the definition of the notion of matter served to weaken the position of Chernyshevsky in the struggle. On these grounds Chernyshevsky was attacked by idealists and agnostics. V.I. Lenin repeatedly rose to the defence of Chernyshevsky. In his book Materialism and Empiriocriticism, a special chapter entitled "From What Angle Did N.G. Chernyshevsky Criticise Kantianism?" pointed out: "Chernyshevsky is the only really great Russian writer who ... was able to keep on the level of an integral philosophical materialism and who spurned the wretched nonsense of the neo-Kantians, positivists, Machists, and other muddleheads."¹

Materialist philosophy was enormously successful in the elaboration of theories on matter and in the struggle against idealism and agnosticism throughout its long history from the antiquity to the early 19th century. It offered a convincing justification of the objective nature of matter and of its cognisability; in conformity with the level of scientific knowledge, it elaborated a theory on the structure of matter, on the relationship of matter and motion, and demonstrated the objective nature of space and time.

The theory on matter, however, had some insufficiencies, which became particularly evident in the mid-19th century, when social production, science and world philosophical thought attained a high level of development. Among these, mention should be made first and foremost of the lack of a comprehensive and systematic study of the concept of matter. The whole picture of theories on matter appears most colourful only from a historical perspective, if the entire history of materialist philosophy is dealt with. As for individual theories, each suffered from shortcomings even in the context of

¹. V.I. Lenin, Collected Works, Vol. 14, p. 361.

its own time. In the mid-19th century it became clear that the most serious of those was the metaphysical approach to understanding matter - matter, motion, space, and time were, more often than not, regarded as isolated and independent concepts, or as independent foundations of the Universe. The unity of matter and motion, if and when upheld, was rather a matter of guesswork than of well-founded scientific approach.

A mechanism whereby the motion of matter and changes in nature were regarded as varieties of mechanical movement was a significant shortcoming.

The most important drawback of the previous theories on matter was that they could not be extended to social life. Matter was identified with nature, and it was for this reason that old materialists were unable to pinpoint the material foundations of social life and of the history of mankind.

It took Marx, Engels and Lenin to make a revolutions in the theory on matter as well as other branches of philosophy.

The Concept of Matter

The most important contribution by the founders of Marxism to the elaboration of a qualitatively new understanding of matter lies in their discovery

of the material foundation of social life. Pre-Marxian philosophy in its entirely, both materialism and idealism, approached the analysis of historical social processes from idealist positions. Philosophers preceding Marx thought that social transformations took place under the impact of the will, intentions and interests of men, mostly influential persons like kings, emperors, generals, or educationalists, writers and philosophers. They regarded society as the sum total of individuals, and man as a being whose determining characteristic is thinking.

Marx went much further in his analysis of the essence of man. He revealed the underlying basis of the formation of all human qualities. This basis is labour, social production activities of men. Labour is the material process of transformation of natural environment by man. It is not only the nature around man that is modified in the process of labour; one also changes oneself, one's own nature. Man improves his abilities

and knowledge; develops his intellect. For the performance of labour, man creates and uses work implements which he constantly develops and improves to make the labour more effective. Rather than take place in isolation, labour activity is performed jointly by large groups of people; and objective inter-relationships are formed between them required for the purposes of improving the productivity of labour. Thus, Marx reveals the objective process underlying all social life. The process comprises labour, social production activities, development of labour implements, relations between men in the process of labour, their development, and the development of man himself. It is this process that forms the matter of social life, which is, like nature, objective with respect to human desires, interests, and thoughts, and all spiritual life; its laws are not governed by the will of man, like those of nature. On the contrary, the will of man, his wishes, ideas, etc., are determined by the matter of social life. "The phantoms formed in the brains of man," Marx and Engels pointed out, "are also, necessarily, sublimates of their material life-process, which is empirically verifiable if and bound to material premises."¹

The discovery of the matter of social life introduced significant changes in the philosophical understanding of matter. The changes consist in a significant widening of the concept of matter to include, besides nature, the foundations of social life. V.I. Lenin pointed out that Marx had effected "the consistent continuation and extension of materialism into the domain of social phenomena".² Thus, matter appeared as the genuine basis of the world, both natural and social. This, in turn, signified the existence of common material laws effective both in nature and in society, the study of which presents a single complete explanation of the world, and, in particular, of social life.

The discovery of the matter of social life permitted to

1. K. Marx, F. Engels, Collected Works, Vol. 5, p. 361.

2. V.I. Lenin, Collected Works, Vol. 21, p. 56.

justify, reveal and develop on a qualitatively new level the provisions surmised by ancient thinkers concerning the diversity of forms of matter. Marx demonstrated the existence of matter not only in the form of natural elements or processes, but also in the form of social activities, social relations not divisible into material elements. In turn, this meant that its objective nature, its existence outside and independently of human consciousness, was a most important aspect of matter.

Further, the approach to labour as a material process meant that matter was not merely an outside objective environment but also an objective reality which man interacted with while cognising it, mastering it, and introducing certain changes in it.

The discovery of the matter of social life set the stage for a new approach to the motion of matter, to space and time. This is dealt with in the following sections.

Significant changes in the philosophical understanding of matter brought forth by the discovery of the matter of social life resulted in a problem of cardinal importance, that of a comprehensive development of philosophical theory on matter. This required, on the basis of concepts of matter of social life, undertaking an analysis of nature as objective reality, taking into account the latest developments of natural sciences.

Marx and Engels never lost sight of the above task after elaborating a new approach to matter in the 1840s and 1850s. It was only in the 1870s and 1880s, however, that they concentrated on the elaboration of a comprehensive philosophical theory of matter. This was due to a number of objective circumstances. Primarily, an urgent historical need for the development of a theory of class struggle of the proletariat forced Marx and Engels to focus their attention on the development of historical materialism; according to Lenin, they "...applied -- and showed how to apply -- this same materialism in the sphere of the social sciences..."¹ Secondly,

1. V.I. Lenin, Collected Works, Vol. 14, p. 336.

this was due to the development of natural science itself. Revolutionary breakthroughs in science, which began in 1840s with the discoveries of the law of conservation and transformation of energy, of cell structure of living organisms, etc, were completed, in relative terms, only in the 1870s. In 1886 Engels pointed out that before that time "natural science was still in that process of violent fermentation which only during the last fifteen years had reached a clarifying, relative conclusion. New scientific data were acquired to a hitherto unheard-of extent, but the establishing of interrelation, and thereby the bringing of order into this chaos of discoveries following closely upon each other's heels, has only quite recently become possible."¹ Since the 1860s and through their later life, Marx and Engels gave much attention to the study and philosophical analysis of developments in natural science, in mechanics, physics, chemistry, biology, geology, and mathematics. Research demonstrated that science, by penetrating the fundamental processes of natural environment, revealed the dialectics of nature, the struggle of opposing forces, tendencies and properties characteristic of natural processes, demonstrated the interrelationship and interdependence of natural phenomena; it demonstrated that nature was characterised by the transition of quantitative changes into qualitative ones, by the emergence of the new and disappearance of the old, by emerging possibilities becoming reality, by the existence of cause-and-effect relations, etc.

Social processes, the development of social production, social progress, class struggle between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie, revolutionary transformations, are all markedly dialectical in nature. At the same time, Marx and Engels found that the mode of thinking, methods of research, and the understanding by scientists of the environment and of the achievements of science themselves had remained unaltered and metaphysical; natural scientists were prone to treating natural phenomena and processes in isolation, as if

¹. Karl Marx, Frederich Engels, Selected Works in three volumes, Vol. 3, p. 351.

justify, reveal and develop on a qualitatively new level the provisions surmised by ancient thinkers concerning the diversity of forms of matter. Marx demonstrated the existence of matter not only in the form of natural elements or processes, but also in the form of social activities, social relations not divisible into material elements. In turn, this meant that its objective nature, its existence outside and independently of human consciousness, was a most important aspect of matter.

Further, the approach to labour as a material process meant that matter was not merely an outside objective environment but also an objective reality which man interacted with while cognising it, mastering it, and introducing certain changes in it.

The discovery of the matter of social life set the stage for a new approach to the motion of matter, to space and time. This is dealt with in the following sections.

Significant changes in the philosophical understanding of matter brought forth by the discovery of the matter of social life resulted in a problem of cardinal importance, that of a comprehensive development of philosophical theory on matter. This required, on the basis of concepts of matter of social life, undertaking an analysis of nature as objective reality, taking into account the latest developments of natural sciences.

Marx and Engels never lost sight of the above task after elaborating a new approach to matter in the 1840s and 1850s. It was only in the 1870s and 1880s, however, that they concentrated on the elaboration of a comprehensive philosophical theory of matter. This was due to a number of objective circumstances. Primarily, an urgent historical need for the development of a theory of class struggle of the proletariat forced Marx and Engels to focus their attention on the development of historical materialism; according to Lenin, they "...applied -- and showed how to apply -- this same materialism in the sphere of the social sciences..."¹ Secondly,

1. V.I. Lenin, Collected Works, Vol. 14, p. 336.

this was due to the development of natural science itself. Revolutionary breakthroughs in science, which began in 1840s with the discoveries of the law of conservation and transformation of energy, of cell structure of living organisms, etc., were completed, in relative terms, only in the 1870s. In 1886 Engels pointed out that before that time "natural science was still in that process of violent fermentation which only during the last fifteen years had reached a clarifying, relative conclusion. New scientific data were acquired to a hitherto unheard-of extent, but the establishing of interrelation, and thereby the bringing of order into this chaos of discoveries following closely upon each other's heels, has only quite recently become possible."¹ Since the 1860s and through their later life, Marx and Engels gave much attention to the study and philosophical analysis of developments in natural science, in mechanics, physics, chemistry, biology, geology, and mathematics. Research demonstrated that science, by penetrating the fundamental processes of natural environment, revealed the dialectics of nature, the struggle of opposing forces, tendencies and properties characteristic of natural processes, demonstrated the interrelationship and interdependence of natural phenomena; it demonstrated that nature was characterised by the transition of quantitative changes into qualitative ones, by the emergence of the new and disappearance of the old, by emerging possibilities becoming reality, by the existence of cause-and-effect relations, etc.

Social processes, the development of social production, social progress, class struggle between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie, revolutionary transformations, are all markedly dialectical in nature. At the same time, Marx and Engels found that the mode of thinking, methods of research, and the understanding by scientists of the environment and of the achievements of science themselves had remained unaltered and metaphysical; natural scientists were prone to treating natural phenomena and processes in isolation, as if

¹. Karl Marx, Frederich Engels, Selected Works in three volumes, Vol. 3, p. 351.

they were independent, static, unchangeable and inalterable. What emerged in science, Engels pointed out, was a "conflict of the results of discovery with preconceived modes of thinking."¹ What was the way out of the difficulties encountered by the natural science of the time as envisaged by Engels? The way out was the elimination of the basic contradiction impeding further development of science, i.e. bringing the mode of thinking in accordance with the development of natural science itself. "And here there is really no other way out," Engels pointed out, "no other possibility of achieving clarity, than by a return, in one form or another, from metaphysical to dialectical thinking."² Under the impact of specific data provided by natural science, scientists in isolated cases became aware of the need for adopting a dialectical understanding of the world. The process, however, was neither difficult, complicated, and fraught with extreme contradictions. Engels repeatedly pointed out, that as science developed, the conflict between the dialectical nature of scientific discoveries and the metaphysical way of thinking became increasingly acute.

The task of a comprehensive development of the philosophical theory of matter thus became more specific: what was needed was a demonstration of dialectical nature of matter, in nature and in society, development of a dialectical mode of thinking and a demonstration of its practical application, in research. To summarize: to which purpose should

Marx concentrated his efforts on the elaboration of new dialectics of matter of social life, including the development of labour, social production, and of economic relations of production. The efforts resulted in four volumes of Capital (Das Kapital); A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy and other works, where, according to V.I. Lenin, Marx "treats the social movements as a process of natural history"³, subject not only to its own specific social laws in

1. F. Engels, Anti-Dühring, p. 35. Die Dialectik im Sozialen Leben.

2. F. Engels, Dialectics of Nature, p. 45.

3. V.I. Lenin, Collected Works, Vol. 1, p. 166. Die Dialectik im Sozialen Leben.

but also to universal laws of motion of matter. In this sense, Lenin points out further, "economic life constitutes a phenomenon analogous to the history of evolution" in biology, physics, and chemistry, among other fields.¹

Engels concentrated primarily on the study of dialectics of nature and of dialectical essence of natural science. In the process, Marx and Engels treated society and nature solely as different forms of the single objectively existing matter, rather than as two separate subjects for study. Thus, they systematically compared and verified the results of their research. They were also engaged in a struggle against various kinds of idealistic and metaphysical doctrines. The process resulted in Engels' Anti-Dühring, several sections of which were written by Marx.

Engels approached a general dialectical materialist definition of the concept of matter by revealing the dialectics of development of individual forms of matter, studying their interrelationships and movement from inferior forms to superior ones, by analysing the basic laws of dialectics operating in nature, etc. Outstanding scientific, philosophical and methodological results were attained. Some of them are described further on. Engels' basic study of problems of matter, Dialectics of Nature, unfortunately, was not completed.² Time prevented the founders of Marxism from elaborating a complete dialectical and materialistic definition of the concept of matter.

The work was carried on by V.I. Lenin.

The conflict between the nature of scientific discoveries and the predominant mode of thinking, pointed out by Engels, was very rapidly aggravating as natural science developed throughout the second half of the 19th century; by the late 1800s and early 1900s it became most acute. Lenin described the ensuing situation as a crisis of methodological basis of natural science. To understand the nature of the crisis and of Lenin's analysis of the ensuing situation in natural science, one has to take into account two aspects: a) the under-

1. V.I. Lenin, Collected Works, Vol. 1, p. 167.

2. F. Engels' Dialectics of Nature remained a manuscript until its first publication in the USSR in 1925.

standing of matter by the scientists of the late 19th century, and b) the philosophical meaning of scientific discoveries made in the late 19th and early 20th centuries.

Development of the Approach
to Matter from the Viewpoint
of Natural Science

The dialectical materialist approach to matter in the process of elaboration by Marx and Engels was well known to working class activists and Communists, comrades-in-arms of the founders of Marxism. The bulk of natural scientists, however, were not aware of dialectics and maintained the position of old pre-Marxian metaphysical materialism. Under the influence of scientific tradition going back to Newton and others they considered matter to be everything which consisted of further indivisible atoms subject to the laws of mechanical movement. They identified matter with substance. They held the position of mechanism, i.e. attempted to explain all processes they studied by the laws of mechanics, as they held that only the laws of mechanics governed the world. And since the laws of mechanics and properties of atoms seemed already basically established, scientific cognition of the world seemed approaching its end and nearing completion.

Academician Igor Tamm wrote, "By the end of the last century, a measure of complacency and smugness was felt among physicists; the dominant opinion was that the basic physical laws had already been discovered, and what remained were finishing touches, albeit significant but still within the framework of firmly established foundations. This was the meaning of a statement made by William Thomson (Lord Kelvin), an outstanding physicist, in a speech made at the turn of the century. He did mention, though, that two clouds still obscured the otherwise clear and uneventful physical horizon, one related to the Michelson experiment, and the other to the so-called ultraviolet clash occurring in an examination of the heat balance between substance and radiation. The first 'cloud' was to evolve into the theory of relativity, and the latter into the quantum theory."¹

¹. I. Ye. Tamm, "A. Einstein and Modern Physics", in Einstein in Sovremennaya Fizika, Moscow, 1956, pp.87-88 (in Russian).

This complacency and the conviction that all the basic laws of the world were already known and that the mission of science was approaching its completion, were followed by one scientific discovery after another which shattered all the dominant notions of matter, its laws and the process of cognition.

Some of these discoveries are described below.

In the late 1860s and early 1870s British physicist Maxwell (1831-1879) obtained a theoretical justification of the unity of electrical and magnetic phenomena and discovered the electromagnetic field as a separate, distinct from substance, state of matter. In an appraisal of the discovery, A. Einstein said that a great breakthrough had been achieved there which would always be associated with the names of Faraday, Maxwell, and Hertz. The lion's share of credit for the revolution was due to Maxwell. After Maxwell, physical reality was thought of in the form of continuous fields not subject to a mechanical explanation. This change of the concept of reality, he continued, was the most profound and fruitful of those experienced by physics since Newton.¹ It became clear, Einstein remarked elsewhere, that we deal with two realities, that of matter and that of field.²

The existence of a non-material state of matter was also proved by the discovery of rays named after Wilhelm Konrad Roentgen (1845-1923), the German physicist (Roentgen rays, better known as X-rays), by the discovery of radioactivity by Sklodowska-Curie (1867-1934), etc.

In 1897, British physicist Joseph John Thomson (1856-1940) in the famous Cavendish Laboratory split the atom and discovered its component part, the electron. It was also found out that the electron does not have a permanent mass, as opposed to classical physical objects.

In 1900, German physicist Max Planck (1858-1947) discovered the quantum, the elemental unit of energy. This dis-

1. See A. Einstein, Collected Scientific Works, Vol. 4, p. 138.

2. A. Einstein, L. Infeld, Evolutsiya Fiziki (The Evolution of Physics), Moscow-Leningrad, 1948, p. 221 (Russ. ed.).

covery, along with the discovery of the electron, signified the penetration of human knowledge into the microcosm and was at the origins of quantum mechanics which has since been developed.

In 1905 Albert Einstein (1879-1955) has discovered an ion elementary particle of light - photon, and has worked out his special theory of relativity which has shown a whole spectrum of new objective laws of the world that were first to prove.

The totality of these discoveries was called by V.I. Lenin the latest revolution in natural science. It has become in the conclusion of the achievements of science which occurred in the duration of the second half of the 19th century, and so has given at the same time the start to a qualitatively new stage of scientific knowledge characteristic of the 20th century. Born and still developing in 1905, it now stands

The basic philosophic significance of the revolution consists in the fact that it resulted in the solution of the major conflict of natural science pointed out by Engels. The new discoveries have manifested in the eyes of scientists the dialectics of nature and the process of cognition; they have de-atomized and uprooted the old notions of matter and the metaphysical mode of thinking. They have demonstrated that the matter is not only a substance but a field, that the substance and the field are the two opposites the interaction of which creates conditions the existence of the multiple variety of material phenomena and processes; that matter is not only the macro-world of directly observed by us but the microcosm, ruled by laws totally different, non-mechanical laws. They have manifested that the quantitative alteration of velocity of objects, it brings about qualitative changes in the objects themselves; as their mass grows, there appears the unity of space and time; the spatial and temporal characteristics of objects change, the motion becomes subject to a different type of laws, among the laws of relativity and statics; that the composition of matter should not be reduced to atoms, etc. In other words, the

The revolution in natural science has also demonstrated that the process of cognition itself is subject to qualitative changes, it goes over to a new level and is a dialectical process.

Слово «дialektika» впервые было употреблено в 1857 г.

All this, however, has not been understood at once by the scientists of the late 19th and early 20th century. The metaphysical way of thinking was too strong. The new discoveries were misinterpreted. The overwhelming majority of scientists looked upon them as the destruction of matter, denouncing of materialism and as the proof of the fact that science is incapable of getting true knowledge. A well-known French physicist L. Houllevigue, in his book The Evolution of the Sciences (1908), entitles his chapter on the new theories of matter "Does Matter Exist?" He says. "The atom dematerialises... matter disappears". A critical situation took place in science. "The essence of crisis in modern physics consists in the break-down of the old laws and basic principles, in the rejection of an objective reality existing outside the mind, that is, in the replacement of materialism by idealism and agnosticism."¹

Due to this crisis the doctrine of Austrian physicist and philosopher Ernst Mach, empiriocriticism, or Machism became widespread among scientists.

Machism is a subjective idealist doctrine. Mach substitutes sensations which he considered to be the elements of the world for material objects and bodies existing in reality. "Not the things (bodies)," he held, "but colours, sounds, pressures, spaces, times (what we usually call sensations) are the real elements of the world."² All things, according to Mach, are complexes of sensations, matter also appears to be something secondary, a derivative of sensations. "For us matter is not what is primarily given," says Mach. "Rather, what is primarily given are the elements (which in a certain familiar relation are designated as sensations)".³

1. V.I. Lenin, Collected Works, Vol. 14, p. 258.

2. Quoted in V.I. Lenin, Collected Works, Vol. 14, p. 40.

3. Ibid., p. 45

covery, along with the discovery of the electron, signified the penetration of human knowledge into the microcosm and was at the origins of quantum mechanics which now occupies

In 1905 Albert Einstein (1879-1955) has discovered an elementary particle of light - photon; and has worked out a special theory of relativity which has shown a whole spectrum of new objective laws of the world to which must be added

The totality of these discoveries was called by V.I. Lenin "the latest revolution in natural science". It has become an the conclusion of the achievements of science which occurred in the duration of the second half of the 19th century; and it has given at the same time the start to a qualitatively new stage of scientific knowledge characteristic of the 20th century. A century seen the development of the basic fields of

The basic philosophic significance of the revolution in natural science consists in the fact that it resulted in the solution of the major conflict of natural science pointed out by Engels. The new discoveries have manifested in the eyes of scientists the dialectics of nature and the process of cognition; they have de-rooted and unrooted the old notions of matter and the metaphysical mode of thinking. They have demonstrated that the matter is not only a substance but a field, that the substance and the field are the two opposites the interaction of which in the conditions the existence of the multiple variety of material phenomena and processes; that matter is not only the macrocosm directly observed by us but a microcosm, ruled by a set of totally different, non-mechanical laws. They have manifested that the quantitative alteration of velocity of objects in space brings about qualitative changes in the objects themselves; if their mass grows, there appears the unity of space and time; if the spatial and temporal characteristics of objects change, the motion becomes subject to a different type of laws, where the laws of relativity and statics, that the composition of matter should not be reduced to atoms, etc.

The revolution in natural science has also demonstrated that the process of cognition itself is subject to qualitative changes, it goes over to a new level and is a dialectical process.

С. А. Соловьев. Вопросы философии науки и техники

All this, however, has not been understood at once by the scientists of the late 19th and early 20th century. The metaphysical way of thinking was too strong. The new discoveries were misinterpreted. The overwhelming majority of scientists looked upon them as the destruction of matter, denouncing materialism and as the proof of the fact that science is incapable of getting true knowledge. A well-known French physicist L. Houllevigue, in his book The Evolution of the Sciences (1908), entitles his chapter on the new theories of matter "Does Matter Exist?" He says: "The atom dematerialises when matter disappears". A critical situation took place in science. "The essence of crisis in modern physics consists in the break-down of the old laws and basic principles, in the rejection of an objective reality existing outside the mind; that is, in the replacement of materialism by idealism and agnosticism."¹

Lenin's Criticism of Machism
Due to this crisis the doctrine of Austrian physicist and philosopher Ernst Mach, empiricism or subjective criticism of reality, orocriticism, or Machism became widespread among scientists.

Machism is a subjective idealist doctrine. Mach substitutes sensations which he considered to be the elements of the world for material objects and bodies existing in reality. "Not the things (bodies), he held, "but colours, sounds, pressures, spaces, times (what we usually call sensations) are the real elements of the world."² All things, according to Mach, are complexes of sensations, matter also appears to be something secondary, a derivative of sensations. "For us matter is not what is primarily given," says Mach. "Rather, what is primarily given are the elements (which in a certain familiar relation are designated as sensations)".³

1. V.I. Lenin, Collected Works, Vol. 14, p. 258.

2. Quoted in V.I. Lenin, Collected Works, Vol. 14, p. 40.

3. Ibid., p. 45.

Machism was quite popular among scientists. Prominent French physicist and mathematician Henri Poincare also pointed out that things are "groups of sensations". Albert Einstein also adhered to Mach's point of view, though later subjected his doctrine to critical analysis. He wrote that in his young years he was highly impressed by Mach's epistemological proposition which then appeared to him fallacious in some of its essential aspects.¹

In the early 20th century empiriocriticism became widespread both among natural scientists and humanitarian intelligentsia and also among a certain part of activists of the workers' movement. This was due primarily to the reaction in the field of ideology which had its way after the defeat of the Revolution in 1905. Those who previously associated with Marxism or were not its ardent supporters considered the defeat of the revolution a refutation of Marx's doctrine, a proof of it being obsolete. It seemed to them, that Machism was corroborated by the data of natural science and was the highest stage of the development of philosophic thought. They began to substitute Machism for Marxism, trying to prove, as Lenin said "that Machism is compatible with the historical materialism".² In these conditions the most active were the revisionists Karl Kautsky, Eduard Bernstein and others.

Thus, a dangerous situation in natural science, philosophy, and workers' movement occurred at the turn of the 20th century. The lack of correct dialectical materialist generalisation of the discoveries of natural science threatened the very foundations of the Marxist world outlook.

The party of the working class faced the historical necessity to make an analysis of scientific achievements from the standpoint of dialectical materialism, to defeat empiriocriticism as a new trend of bourgeois philosophy, to subject to criticism various attempts to revise Marxism, to defend and further develop dialectical and historical materialism in conformity with scientific achievements and revolutionary

1. See A. Einstein, "Creative Autobiography", in Einstein i Sovremenaya Fizika, p. 36.

2. V.I. Lenin, Collected Works, Vol. 14, p. 314.

practice. In essence, this meant an urgent practical need for further elaboration of the doctrine of dialectical materialism on matter, the doctrine Marx and Engels were not able to conclude.

This was done by Lenin in his book Materialism and Empirio-Criticism published in 1909.

An all-round analysis of the situation in science, philosophy and the theory of revolution manifested to Lenin the fact that the key problem was the concept of matter. The critical situation in science, the conversion of the majority of scientists from materialism to idealism were due to the fact that the scientists identified matter with atoms, with concrete notion of its composition, they looked upon mechanical laws as absolutely true and limited their understanding of matter only by substance. Being unable to grasp the essence of new phenomena they understood them as disappearance of matter. "'Matter disappears' means that the limit within which we have hitherto known matter disappears and that our knowledge is penetrating deeper; properties of matter are likewise disappearing which formerly seemed absolute, immutable, and primary ... and which are now revealed to be relative and characteristic only of certain states of matter."¹ Science have demonstrated that atom is not the final indivisible particle. But this does not mean that after this matter should be reduced to electrons, photons or quanta of action. Lenin said: "The electron is as inexhaustible as the atom, nature is infinite..."² Scientists looked upon mechanical laws as absolute ones, considered them applicable to the whole of the world, to matter as a whole. However, when electromagnetic processes subjected to different laws were discovered, they came to the conclusion that there were no laws at all in the world. Arguing with such outlooks Lenin said: "The world is matter in motion, we reply, and the laws of its motion are reflected by mechanics in the case of moderate velocities and by the electromagnetic theory in the case of great velocities."³

1. V.I. Lenin, Collected Works, Vol. 14, p. 260

2. Ibid., p. 262.

3. Ibid., p. 281.

But his doesn't mean that matter is limited only by these two states - substance and electromagnetic field. Science will yet discover many phenomena, processes, and properties which will be contrary to the established ideas and will seem strange. But this cannot mean that matter disappears or is the result of our imagination. "Human reason," Lenin stated, "has discovered many amazing things in nature and will discover still more, and will thereby increase its power over nature. But this does not mean that nature is the creation of our mind or of abstract mind."¹ Not once Lenin referred to Marx and Engels showing that "the destructibility of the atom, its inexhaustibility, the mutability of all forms of matter and of its motion, have always been the stronghold of dialectical materialism."² And modern science corroborates the correctness of dialectical materialism, the doctrine of Marx and Engels of the dialectical character of matter.

By continuing to develop the conception of Marx and Engels on matter known to him and summing up the scientific achievements of the early 20th century, Lenin gave a complete dialectic-materialist definition of the notion of matter 'Matter is a philosophical category denoting the objective reality which is given to man by his sensations, and which is copied, photographed and reflected by our sensations, while existing independently of them.'³

This definition is the generalisation of the historically protracted development of materialist philosophy studying matter. It contains the following major principles. First of all, Lenin points out that matter is a philosophical category denoting the entire objective reality. This part of Lenin's definition is the direct elaboration of the principle worked out by Engels in Dialectics of Nature - matter is abstraction. We leave out of account the qualitative differences of things in lumping them together as corporeally existing things

1. V.I. Lenin, Collected Works, Vol. 14, pp. 281-282.

2. Ibid., p. 281.

3. Ibid., p. 130

under the concept 'matter.' Hence matter as such, as distinct from definite existing pieces of matter, is not anything sensuously existing."¹ Matter is a general concept; it cannot be reduced to this or that specific manifestation of matter, to atoms, electrons, etc. Engels pointed out: "When natural science directs its efforts to seeking out uniform matter as such, to reducing qualitative differences to merely quantitative differences in combining identical smallest particles, it is doing the same thing as demanding to see fruit as such instead of cherries, pears, apples."² One of the causes of the crisis in natural science was the fact that scientists reduced the concept of matter to atoms, the motion of matter to mechanical motion, etc.

Lenin summed up the latest achievements of natural science into a united philosophical category of matter as an objective reality. Elaborating the doctrine of Marx and Engels Lenin also includes matter of social being in the category. "Materialism in general recognises objectively real being (matter) as independent of the consciousness, sensation, experience, etc., of humanity." Historical materialism recognises social being as independent of the social consciousness of humanity."³ Lenin's philosophical definition of matter reflects its absolute properties, the ideas of which form the foundation of the scientific theory of knowledge.

Another point of Lenin's philosophical doctrine of matter is the indication to the cognisability of matter, to the fact that matter is reflected by our sensations. This principle is directly aimed against agnosticism which was widely spread among scientists due to the crisis in science. The scientists who considered classical mechanics to be absolute and all basic laws of matter known went, under the pressure of the avalanche of new discoveries, to another extreme — into the embrace of agnosticism which denied the capability of man

1. Frederick Engels, "Dialectics of Nature," p. 255.
2. Ibid., p. 255.
3. V.I. Lenin, Collected Works, Vol. 14, p. 321.

to cognise the world, to get objectively true knowledge about it. Mach declared that the basic task of science is the research of the laws of connection between sensations and ideas¹, the analysis of combination of sensations. Neo-Kantianism became popular in science and philosophy, a subjective idealist trend the advocates of which strived to revive Kant's doctrine and to interpret the new scientific achievements in the spirit of Kantian agnosticism. Lenin explained the causes of popularity of Neo-Kantianism. "The great successes achieved by natural science, the approach to elements of matter so homogeneous and simple that their laws of motion can be treated mathematically, caused the mathematicians to overlook matter 'Matter disappears', only equations remain. At a new stage of development and apparently in a new manner, we get the old Kantian idea: Reason prescribes laws to nature."² The founder of Marburg school of Neo-Kantianism Herman Cohen (1842-1918) asserted: "We start with thinking. Thinking should not have another source but itself."³

Another representative of the school Ernst C. Kassirer (1874-1945) pointed out that matter "is reduced to ideal conceptions created and tested by mathematics."⁴ Criticising Neo-Kantianism Lenin said that if matter has disappeared and only equations are left (or according to Kassirer, matter is an ideal conception), then one may ask, where the equations exist, what they are. Mathematical equations (an ideal conception) is a human mind. And the mind is a function of that particularly complex fragment of matter called the human brain."⁵ If the human brain exists then matter has not disappeared.

-
1. V.I. Lenin, Collected Works, Vol. 14, p. 40.
 2. Ibid., p. 308.
 3. H. Cohen, Logik der zeinen Erkenntnis, Berlin, 1922, S. 13.
 4. E. Kassirer, Cognition and Reality, Collected Articles, 1912, p. 222 (Russ. ed.).
 5. V.I. Lenin, Collected Works, Vol. 14, p. 228.

The Concept of Matter
Elaborated by Lenin

Lenin showed that cognition
is directed at the discovery
of laws of objectively exist-

ing matter. The process of cognition is infinite, because nature is inexhaustible, infinite in time and space, is in the state of constant mutability, development, it forms new laws, properties, processes which are a new object for cognition.

In his definition of matter Lenin overcomes the drawback that existed in the definition of matter given by Chernyshevsky. Lenin underlines that matter is principally accessible for human sense organs to percept its properties and laws.

Another major point of the Lenin's philosophical doctrine on matter is the indication to the objectiveness of matter, to its existence apart and independently of our sensations. Eliminating the drawback of the definition of matter given in The System of Nature by Holbach, Lenin refutes subjective idealism, empiriocriticism, which saw matter as combinations of sensations. Criticising subjective idealism Lenin puts a question which, as he points out, "is the most poisonous for Mach's philosophy" -- "if nature existed before man". Lenin has shown that the point of view of Machism is contradictory to the basic principles of natural science which proved that Earth existed in such a state when there was no living creature whatsoever and could not exist, and hence there existed no sensing matter, no combinations of sensations. "Matter is primary, and thought, consciousness, sensation are products of a very high development. Such is the materialist theory of knowledge, to which natural science instinctively subscribes,"¹ Lenin said. As if to corroborate these words of Lenin, in the same 1908 when Materialism and Empirio-Criticism was being written, Max Planck, a great natural scientist, put the same question when he attacked Machism in his so-called Leiden Report: "Is the physical picture of the world eventually more or less arbitrary creation of our spirit, or we have

1. V.I. Lenin, Collected Works, Vol. 14, p. 75.

to recognise that it reflects real, independent from it processes of nature? Speaking in more specific terms: must we prudently maintain that the principle of conservation of energy operated in nature as far back as when not a single man could think of it, or that celestial bodies would move according to the law of gravitation even then when our Earth with all its inhabitants becomes rubble?"¹ Naturally, Planck unreservedly gave a positive answer to the question thus speaking from the standpoint of materialism against Mach.²

Lenin's definition of matter is of great methodological value. It is of great importance for the formation of scientific world outlook, for the defence of materialism and struggle against idealism and other anti-scientific conceptions, for working out scientific principles, to serve the basis for further development of science, instead of making known truth absolute, for broader perception of the new. "The belief in the existence of the outside world not depending on the perceiving subject," wrote Einstein, "is the basis of the natural science as a whole ... our notions of the physical reality we can never be ultimate. We should always be prepared to change the notions."² True scientists, in the course of their research knowingly, and often unknowingly, were, and are guided by the principles of dialectical materialism. Here we offered examples of Max Planck and Albert Einstein, the outstanding scientists of the 20th century. They were not conscious supporters of dialectical materialism; even less so of Lenin's doctrine. However, under the influence of scientific data, discovering objective dialectics of nature, they necessarily had to think materialistically and dialectically, and, when defending science, to fight idealism and agnosticism. All this but corroborates the correctness of dialectical materialism and the fruitfulness of the doctrine on matter worked out by Marx, Engels and Lenin.

1. Max Planck and Philosophy, Moscow, 1963, pp. 19-20 (Russ. ed.).

2. A. Einstein, Collection of Scientific Works, Vol. 4, Moscow, 1966, p. 136 (Russ. ed.).

The dialectical materialist theory of matter elaborated by Lenin laid the theoretical foundation for correct understanding of the progress of modern physics. Thus it is accepted in nuclear physics that modern doctrine on the structure of physical reality is concerned not with immutable structural elements of matter, but with their interrelations and transformations, revealing their properties and structure and relative stability.

The shift in the ratio of the objective and the subjective in the methods of research does not cancel the principle of independence of object from subject cognising it. Lenin's criticism of physical idealism fully preserves its importance at present.

Lenin's philosophic doctrine on matter, its basic principle that "the sole 'property' of matter with whose recognition philosophical materialism is bound up is the property of being an objective reality, of existing outside the mind" have greatly influenced the progress of the philosophy of dialectical materialism all over the world.

By fighting against indeterminism and idealistic interpretations of the achievements of modern science, physics in particular, Marxist philosophers defend dialectical and materialist understanding of matter.

Motion is the Mode of Existence of Matter

Materialist philosophy in the run of its centuries-old history always included the concept of motion of matter in its doctrine of matter. Philosophers of ancient India, China, Greece and Rome repeatedly expressed the idea of the unity of matter and motion, of the motion being a property of matter. However, these general principles needed to be specifically substantiated, the nature of motion itself was to be revealed in all its details, and all this could be done only on the basis of utilisation of the achievements of concrete natural sciences. Rapid progress of natural science capable of

1. V.I. Lenin, Collected Works, Vol. 14, pp. 260-261.

researching the processes of motion in nature began only in the late 16th and early 17th century. This period saw a particularly great progress of mechanics, the science of the spatial motion of bodies. This was due to the need of the developing capitalist mode of production in various machinery, in the first place. Secondly, due to the fact that out of all forms of motion, mechanical motion was the most accessible for research, for it can be observed. The progress of mechanics influenced natural science and materialist philosophy greatly. Mechanism, the notion that there is only mechanical motion in the world and all changes observed in nature should be considered as forms of mechanical motion, became widespread throughout science.

The whole of pre-Marxian materialism professed philosophical mechanism. Apart from one-sided explanation of natural changes, mechanistic materialism had a major fault which inevitably led materialist philosophy to idealism and religion. This fault appeared with the attempts to explain the source of motion, the initial cause of the changes observed in nature. It is known that according to the laws of mechanics in order to bring a body out of state of rest or out of steady straightforward motion there should be an external impulse.

While natural scientists and philosophers speculated about the source of motion of bodies and systems taken separately even on the scale of Solar System they stood on the grounds of materialism. However, when scientists, philosophers in particular, raised the question of the source and cause of motion of matter as a whole and not of its systems taken separately, then, in accordance with mechanical laws, they had to look for a certain external, immaterial force, if not acting constantly then at least having given the initial impulse to matter. This led directly to idealism and religion. According to this notion there should exist a preternatural "watchmaker" who had wound up the world clock-work mechanism which now moves according to mechanical laws. The concept of original source given to the nature by God was evolved by Descartes. In his Treatise on Light he wrote that at the very first moment of creation God laid down the rule that some parts of matter move in one direction and other parts in another, that

some move quickly and others slowly, so that motion occurred in accordance with natural laws.¹ By the motion of bodies in different directions Descartes attempted to explain the hypothetical whirling motion of particles of which, as he thought, all material bodies were formed.

Materialist philosophers of the following generations fought against the concept of initial impulse trying to discover material original causes, to explain the motion of matter without involving immaterial forces. The greatest advances in this direction were made by French materialists of the 18th century. They asserted that motion is an attribute of matter, its intrinsic property, "intimate" force of matter as Diderot said. Holbach wrote in his System of Nature that "motion is a mode of existence following in a necessary way from the essence of matter."²

However, French materialists as well as other materialists of the pre-Marxian period were not able to make more than simple assertion of correct ideas. They did not have enough natural data to substantiate their ideas. Due to this reason, their position in the struggle against idealism and religion was not strong enough. Being basically mechanists they often came close to the concept of the initial impulse and unscientific assertions. Thus Jean Robinet (1735-1820) trying to prove that matter has internal activity came to the conclusion that all matter is alive, consists of tiniest living creatures, in other words he came to hylozoism -- a philosophical doctrine that matter is inseparable from life, which is property of matter.

An important step forward was made by Russian materialist philosophy as compared to French materialists. In the definition of matter made by Chernyshevsky and quoted above, it is said that matter has the qualities which are manifested as forces whose way of activity are the laws of nature. Chernyshevsky also said elsewhere: "The laws of nature is nature

1. See R. Descartes, Selected Works, Moscow, 1950, p. 195. (Russ. ed.).

2. P. Holbach, The System of Nature, 1940, p. 18.

itself examined from the point of view of its activity."¹ So here the unity of matter and motion and its laws is logically proved. However, to substantiate this scientifically facts of science and new discoveries were needed.

Such discoveries were made in the middle of the 19th century. Relying upon them Marx and Engels have accomplished a revolution in the philosophical doctrine of the motion of matter.

One of the new achievements of science was first of all the discovery by Marx and Engels of matter of social life the study of which uncovered the internal source of its motion, interaction of internally united opposites within material production itself. Such opposites are production and consumption. Marx said: "Production is consumption and consumption is production."² Production stimulates with the consumer a new requirement, which stimulates the development of production. The interaction of production and consumption is the internal source of the development of social matter and the deepest cause of social progress.

The interpretation of social production as social matter, as a special state of matter in general and the unfolding of the fact that the interaction of such matter, of social production and nature causes changes both in production and the nature involved in production, brought about the conclusion that the interaction of various states and forms of matter is the source of its motion. All this also proved that apart from mechanical there are other laws, and social laws are among them.

These conceptions of Marx and Engels were corroborated and further evolved by the analysis of great discoveries of the 19th century: the law of conservation and transformation of energy, cellular structure of living organisms, Charles Darwin's evolution theory.

1. N. Chernyshevsky, Collected Works, Vol. 10, Moscow, 1951, p. 988 (in Russian).

2. Karl Marx, A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy, Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1977, p. 198.

The importance of these discoveries for the philosophic doctrine of the motion of matter consisted in the following.

The discovery of the law of conservation and transformation of energy manifested that, firstly, in the world there acts the principle of preservation of force; motion and energy do not disappear and do not originate from nothing. Consequently, the input of energy, the impulse to nature from outside is impossible in principle, it contradicts to the laws of nature; secondly, it was proved that there existed a variety of types and forms of energy, and, consequently, a variety of forms of the motion of matter and not only mechanical motion as it was thought before; thirdly, the source of the motion of matter, the basis of the existence of energy is the interaction of the forms of motion of matter themselves, the conversion of one form of energy into another.

The discovery of the cellular structure of living organisms has manifested that the motion of material objects is not only the motion of bodies in space or the change of quantity (increasing or diminishing), but the process of development, quality transformation, because out of an initial cell which is a complex biochemical system an organism is formed and it does not at all resemble the cell. And here the source of development is the internal process of cell-division.

Darwin's evolution theory has shown that, firstly, in the course of evolution there occur complicated quality transformations or historical development; secondly, the source of this development is the interaction of an organism with the environment, in other words the internal source.

Both biological discoveries have manifested the specific feature of the biological form of the motion of matter with its own biological laws quite different from mechanical laws.

These scientific discoveries became the basis of natural science for the elaboration of dialectical and historical materialism, the doctrine of motion of matter evolved by Marx and Engels in particular.

The discovery by Marx and Engels of the internal source of the motion of matter alongside with new achievements of natural science, have built up the scientific basis for the conception of motion as the mode of existence of matter pro-

posed by French materialists. It has been shown that motion is really within the very essence of matter, and that matter cannot exist otherwise than in motion, undergoing interaction, transformation, change, struggle of the opposite forces, properties, and tendencies. There is no matter in the world without motion as well as there cannot be motion without matter. Motion is diverse in its manifestations and exists in various forms. Marx and Engels interpret motion as a broad notion: "Motion, as applied to matter, is change in general."¹

Interpretation of motion as the mode of existence of matter has shown that motion is of absolute character; rest also exists but it is relative, for things, processes, and phenomena are in the state of rest only relatively to each other. For instance, trains going alongside, in one direction and with equal speed are in rest relatively to each other, though they are in motion; a house is in rest relatively to the Earth, but together with the Earth it moves around the Sun, together with the Sun it is in motion around the centre of the Galaxy, etc. Rest is only an element of motion. Motion as change in general includes development as well. Engels said: ("Motion is not merely change of place, in fields higher than mechanics it is also change of quality.")² Relying on the analysis of various forms of motion Engels pointed out major forms of the motion of matter which differ from each other according to the following indications: 1) specific features of the material object - the bearer of motion; 2) specific laws functioning in a given form of motion; 3) a place in historical development of matter in the observed part of the Universe.

Forms of Motion of Matter

chemical, biological, and social. The substance of the forms of the motion of matter has been essentially deepened and broadened since the second part of the 19th century when Engels de-

The major forms of the motion of matter are: physical (mechanical motion including),

1. Frederick Engels, Dialectics of Nature, p. 247.

2. Ibid., p. 252.

terminated them. And this is quite natural, for science have made a gigantic leap in the field of cognition of matter. However, the essence of the classification of the forms of motion is still correct.

The mentioned forms of motion in the order of their enumeration present the major stages of the development of matter. It is pointless to speak of the development of matter as a whole, matter in general, because matter is infinite in time and space. In the part of the Universe studied by modern science, however, it is possible to observe quality stages of the development of matter. Substance develops, and this is clearly shown by Mendeleev's periodical law; substance develops from the simplest atoms of hydrogen and helium to complex atoms of uranium, then further to molecules and after that to organic matter, albuminous bodies are formed from molecules.

The lowest of the known at present forms of the motion of matter is the physical one, which, according to modern science, is a spatial motion of bodies, their interaction (elementary particles, atoms, macrobodies, celestial bodies and their systems, etc.); motion and interaction of elementary particles and fields (electromagnetic, gravitation, strong and weak interactions, processes of transformation of elementary particles, etc.).

Chemical form of motion is the motion and interactions of atoms and molecules, formation of their combinations, formation of new chemical properties of substance.

Biological form of motion is the metabolism of organic substances, formation of albuminous bodies from molecules, structure and functioning of cells, their division, the processes of transmission of hereditary properties, life processes of organisms, processes of reflection, self-regulation and control, interaction of organisms, etc.

Social form of the motion of matter is the totality of social life: above all, labour, social production activity as matter of social life, all social relations -- interpersonal, family, class relations, etc.

It is obvious that these forms of the motion of matter are interrelated and are interacting and comprise together the observed matter. In the development of matter these forms of motion consecutively develop from the previous ones. The

basic interconnection among them consists in the fact that according to their structure and laws each higher developed form of motion includes the lowest ones but is not reduced to them and has its own specific properties and laws.

How it can be determined which form is lower and which is higher in the sequel of historic development of matter? The criterion for this is the ability of a certain form of motion to exist independently. For instance, physical motion can exist without the chemical one and moreover without the biological one; in its turn, the chemical form of motion is formed on the basis of the physical one, and the biological form of motion is based on the chemical form and through it on the basis of physical one. Consequently, the lower the form of motion the more stable it is and the less it is subject to disintegration. The major volume of matter in the observed part of the Universe is connected with physical form. The lesser part is connected with the chemical one, the insignificant part of matter, only that on the planet Earth, is connected with biological form of motion, and the tiniest fraction of the volume of matter exists in social form of the motion of matter.¹ Nevertheless, in spite of this the social form of the motion of matter exercises the ever growing influence upon the environment. In the course of its development the humanity involves more material processes into social production, it drastically transforms them, and shapes up "a secondary nature", -creates new chemical elements, new materials with preset properties, stimulates new energetic processes, and through its activity carries on the natural development of matter not only on Earth but in outer space. The human labour itself appears as a variety, a form of the motion of matter, and as a cosmic process, it becomes to ever greater degree, according to Marx, the activity that controls all forces of nature.

Space and Time

In the run of history of philosophy the problems of space and time always occupied an important place in philosophic doctrines. Ancient philosophers pointed out that all elements of the world, earth, water, air,

¹Here we proceed from the fact that according to modern scientific data biological and social life exists only on Earth. It is not known to science if there is life in any form on other celestial objects.

fire, atoms and any other things are "someplace" and "sometime", in other words, in space and time. As it was stated before, some philosophers tried to interpret space and time as independent primal elements of the world, others explained space and time as conditions of material bodies' existence.

The most precise for that period notion of space we find in Ancient Greek science. Giving thought primarily to the problem of space (time appeared to be a far more complicated problem) the Ancient Greek science uncovered the two-fold character of space - absolute and relative ones.

The absolute character of space was pointed out in the philosophy of Democritus. He asserted, that alongside with atoms there existed vacuum as an essential condition for the motion of atoms, for atoms to form various combinations which comprised the objects observed. Vacuum is the space where atoms move.

The relative character of space was presented in the geometry of Euclid who lived in the end of the 4th and the beginning of the 3rd century B.C. Space is shapes, figures of bodies, their lines, angles, planes, etc. It is related to bodies, belongs to them.

Conceptions of absolute and relative character of space influenced greatly the further progress of natural science and philosophy in this field. They were further evolved in new times by Isaac Newton (1643-1727) who applied the notion of the absolute and the relative not only to space but to time. In his famous work The Mathematical Principles of Natural Philosophy he wrote that absolute space is the "empty receptacle of bodies," it is absolute motionless, endless and homogeneous, it exerts no influence upon the motion of bodies inside it. Relative space is the places in absolute space taken by bodies, or the parts of absolute space coinciding with bodies.

Likewise the time is treated. Absolute time is the pure continuity flowing from the past through the present towards the future. This type of time has no relation whatsoever with mechanical processes nor with absolute space. Relative time is the stretch of absolute time during which the bodies move from one place to another.

Relative space and time are used in the study of mechanical motion. However, this has no relation to absolute space and time. They are motionless, infinite, immutable and in this sense

are absolute. Newton wrote: "The order of parts of time is invariable the same way as the order of parts of space. Had they moved from their places, they would advance (so to say) into themselves, for time and space are like their own receptacles and the receptacles of all that exists. In time everything is disposed according to the order of succession, in space - according to the order of position."¹

Newton's conception was materialistic and typical metaphysical, he denied any connection between matter, motion, absolute time, absolute space, and relative space. This conception was widespread in science and was dominating in natural science until the beginning of the 20th century, and in materialist philosophy till the birth and development of dialectical and historical materialism of Marx and Engels.

Before Marx there also existed in philosophy an idealist conception of space and time worked out by Immanuel Kant (1724-1804). According to Kant, the world exists objectively and our senses testify to this effect. However, the sensations tell us nothing of the laws of the world, in particular, of the space-time order of things, processes, and phenomena. Space and time, according to Kant, are the inherent forms of human thought which man brings into the world, he applies them upon unregulated sensations and brings them to order, arranges the disposition of data in space and time. This is a classical subjective idealist conception of space and time.

The revolution in philosophy performed by Marx and Engels was aimed in the field of space and time theory at the criticism of both idealistic and metaphysical interpretation of these categories, on the one hand, and, on the other hand, at elaboration of dialectical materialist doctrine of space and time. As points of departure they used above all their own elaborations of problems of social matter, of dialectical materialism, and the achievements of natural science and progressive philosophy as well.

Studying the process of labour, social production relations, commodity relations, the essence of use value and value, concrete and abstract labour, etc., Marx has uncovered the important role space and time play as modes of existence of

¹. Newton, "The Mathematical Principles of Natural Philosophy," Quoted by A.N.Krylov, Collected Works, Vol.7,, Moscow-Leningrad, 1936, p.31 (in Russian).

social matter in these material processes.

It is essential here to clarify two points in order to understand the whole dialectical materialist conception of space and time. They are: how did Marx arrive at the analysis of the problem of space and time, and how did he understand these categories?

While analysing commodity relations Marx faced a very important task: to find out why two (or more) totally different commodities (for instance, shoe-polish and a frock-coat) could be exchanged. For them to be exchanged there should be something in common, some one and the same common principle which is qualitatively different from the nature of the exchanged commodities and at the same time contains the very essence of the commodities. To solve the problem Marx turns to geometry. And his choice is not accidental. The thing is that in geometry different figures are also compared, the relations (distances) between bodies are determined. Marx points out: "If a thing is distant from another, the distance is in fact a relation between the one thing and the other; but at the same time, the distance is something different from this relation between the two things. It is a dimension of space ..."¹ Space is the objectively common factor of different objects.

Hence, the search of the common factor which makes it possible to exchange commodities boils down to the search of the space of commodities, to finding out how space is reflected specifically in commodity relations.

Looking for the answer Marx resorts to the help of geometrical examples. He compares a triangle and a parallelogram. "In order to equate these different things, each must represent the same common element regardless of the other." And then he puts a question: "But what is this unity of objects exchanged against each other?"² The search of the "unity" led

1. Karl Marx, *Theories of Surplus-Value*, Part III, Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1975, p. 143.

2. Ibid.

Marx to the discovery of abstract labour, labour as the expenditure of human labour power. The analysis of labour and its relation to commodities has manifested that it is not something outward, insignificant, not related to commodities, but, on the contrary, it expresses their very nature, creates their value. In their turn, commodities are not only the result of labour, on the contrary, while being exchanged they uncover the social essence of labour.

Thus the interrelation has been found. From this point of view Marx turns to space in nature and geometry again. Here he discovers dialectical interrelation of material bodies and space (and later on - time) and through this overcomes the metaphysical gap between these categories in the philosophy of Newton and in the whole of the preceding materialism, on the one hand, and, on the other hand, evolves the understanding of space and time in terms of materialist dialectics, which was to be corroborated and elaborated in detail by natural science of the 20th century, by Albert Einstein in particular, in his theory of relativity.

Here is Marx's reasoning: "If we speak of the distance as a relation between two things, we presuppose something 'intrinsic', some 'property' of the things themselves, which enables them to be distant from each other. What is the distance between the syllable A and a table? The question would be nonsensical. In speaking of the distance of two things, we speak of their difference in space. Thus we suppose both of them to be contained in space, to be points of space. Thus we equalise them as being both existences of space, and only after having them equalised sub specie spatii we distinguish them as different points of space. To belong to space is their unity."¹

It is noteworthy that according to Marx space is not something outward in relation to things, is not some empty receptacle which contains things but their inherent property, which is determined by the essence of things themselves;

1. Karl Marx, Theories of Surplus-Value, Part III, p. 143.

"their unity".

Later, in the 20th century the same thought was repeated as a result of the deepest and all-round examination of spatial-temporal characteristic of the world. In his article "On Special and General Theory of Relativity" Albert Einstein pointed out: "According to general theory of relativity the geometrical properties of space are not independent, they are determined by matter."¹

The concurrence of these ideas is not surprising. Marx as a dialectician denied the metaphysical interpretation of space, he correctly grasped the interrelation of material objects and space as the mode of existence of matter. From the same point of view he treated time, in particular its application to material economic processes. Einstein makes dialectical conclusion under the influence of discoveries made by himself and other scientists, the discoveries which convincingly manifested the dialectics of nature.

In their struggle against idealism and metaphysics Marx and Engels come to the conclusion that space and time are the objective forms of the moving matter. To be in space means to be in the form of disposition of one near another, to exist in time means to be in the form of succession of one after another. Engels pointed out: "The two forms of existence of matter are naturally nothing without matter, empty concepts, abstractions which exist only in our minds."² Space and time are organically interrelated with moving matter and, consequently, with each other. From this point of view, Marx and Engels elaborated the problem of absolute and relative character of space and time, traditional for materialist philosophy. Absolute character from the point of view of dialectical materialism consists in the fact that there is no matter in the world without space and time, and on the contrary, there can be no space and time without matter.

However, as it was stated above, "matter in general" does not exist. Matter always exists in certain concrete

1. A. Einstein, Physics and Reality, Collected Papers, Moscow, 1965, p. 222 (Russ. ed.).

2. Frederick Engels, Dialectics of Nature, p. 235.

forms of motion, in certain states. From this it follows that space and time are always relative, they own specific properties corresponding to this or that form, or state of matter.

Dialectical materialist solution of the problem of absolute and relative character of space and time served as a basis for the explanation of the question of their infiniteness.

The problem of whether space and time are infinite or finite has been an object of struggle between materialism and idealism in the run of the history of philosophy. Asserting that the world has been created by some preternatural idea, spirit, God, idealism draws on the conception that space and time have their beginning and ultimate end, in other words, they are finite, limited. On the contrary, materialists spoke infiniteness of space and time. However, the materialists of the pre-Marxian period explained this from the point of view of mechanics: they understood infiniteness of space as a real possibility for a body to move mechanically further and further. Infiniteness is interpreted in the same way on the level of everyday thinking. Hegel called such notion "bad infiniteness" and pointed out that space and time are equally finite and infinite. He interpreted space and time as the stages of development of absolute idea and explained the problems of finiteness and infiniteness from this point of view.

Each stage of development of idea is qualitatively accomplished and, consequently, has its specific individual space-time characteristic. Hence space and time are finite, the same way as a concrete stage of development of idea is finite too. But the idea develops further, it goes through new, qualitatively ultimate stages with specific spatial and temporal characteristics. Infinite development of idea means that space and time are infinite. Due to the idealistic foundation of his philosophy Hegel could not offer a scientific solution to the problem.

From the point of view of dialectical materialism real space and time as modes of the existence of matter are dialectical in their nature, they are both finite and infinite. Lenin pointed out: "'Schlechte Unendlichkeit' - infinity

qualitatively counterposed to finitude, not connected with it, separated from it, and if the finite were Diesseits, and the infinite Jenseits, as if the infinite stood above the finite, outside it ... In fact, however, sind sie (the finite and the infinite) untrennbar. They are a unity.¹ The finiteness of space and time is their relativity. The space and time of this or that state, the forms of the motion of matter have properties, characteristics, objective laws stipulated by this state, by the form of motion of matter. These spatial and temporal characteristics, properties are finite in the sense that they have place and function only within the limits of certain state, within the form of motion.

Absolute character of space and time means their infinity. Beyond this state, the form of motion of matter, and consequently beyond the infinity of space and time, there exist other qualitatively specific forms of motion of matter and hence other spatial-temporal characteristics.

The dialectical materialist interpretation of space and time and the doctrine of matter in general elaborated by Marx and Engels have been corroborated and further developed on the basis of natural science in the course of the revolution in natural science in the early 20th century and in the process of its further progress.

However, the new discoveries of science were first wrongly interpreted for the scientists and some philosophers looked upon the new discoveries from the mechanistic point of view, idealism and agnosticism became widespread in science and philosophy. Space and time were interpreted in Kantian spirit. "Space and time," said Mach, "are well-ordered (wohlgeordnete) systems of series of sensations."² V.I. Lenin subjects the idealism of Mach and other philosophers to criticism and, among other things, points out, that the existence of nature in time measured by millions of years prior to the

1. V.I. Lenin, Collected Works, Vol. 38, p. 112.

2. Quoted by V.I. Lenin, Collected Works, Vol. 14, p. 117

appearance of human sensations proves the absurdity of the idealist theory. Using the latest achievements of natural science Lenin defends and further elaborates dialectical materialist understanding of space and time. Alongside the scientific progress, new achievements, he points out the change and development of our notions of space and time: "Our developing notions of time and space reflect the objectively real time and space."¹ And he also proves that the revolution in natural science, particularly the discovery of velocities close to that of light, has brought about major changes in understanding of space and time as compared to the period when mechanics dominated in science. He wrote: "Mechanics was a copy of real motions of moderate velocity, while the new physics is a copy of real motions of enormous velocity."² In the course of researching of high velocity motions, the new physics has discovered specific space and time characteristics as the forms of existence of previously unknown states of matter.

Lenin considered it necessary that dialectics should be spread among scientists, that methods of cognition should be improved, that notions should be developed in accordance with the new achievements of science.

So we can sum up that the world is moving matter and it cannot move otherwise than in space and time. From here follows the fundamental role of the categories of space and time in philosophy and natural science. And this can be clearly seen in modern Marxist philosophy of various regions of the world.

Modern Natural Science
on Matter and Motion

century modern science emerged which has uncovered for mankind the picture of the world quite different from the one developed

As a result of the revolution in natural science that took place at the end of the 19th and the beginning of the 20th

1. V.I. Lenin, Collected Works, Vol. 14, p. 176.

2. Ibid., p. 265.

by science in the run of more than three centuries of the previous period. If previously the major fields of science which formed the picture of the world were mechanics and metaphysical, mechanistic materialism elaborated by Copernicus, Kepler, Galileo, Newton and other great scientists alongside materialist philosophers, above all French materialists of the 18th century, the major fields of science in the 20th century are the quantum mechanics, the theory of relativity and dialectical materialism elaborated by Marx, Engels, and Lenin.

Modern physics (the quantum mechanics and the theory of relativity) does not deny classical mechanics and does not consider it erroneous but merely points to the limits of its application: the field of macro-bodies and slow motions as compared to the light speed.

The quantum mechanics is the theory studying the laws of the motion of micro-particles (elementary particles, atoms, molecules, nuclei of atoms) and their systems. The authors of the theory are Max Planck, Niels Bohr (1885-1962), Albert Einstein and Louis de Broglie (born in 1892), Paul Dirac (born in 1902), Werner Heisenber (1901-1976), Sergei Vavilov (1891-1961), Pyotr Kapitsa (born in 1894), Lev Landau (1908-1968), Vladimir Fok (1898-1974) and other outstanding scientists of our time.

 The theory of relativity is the theory studying spatial and temporal characteristics of physical processes. The forerunners of its formulation were Nikolai Lobachevsky (1792-1856), Janos Bolyai (1802-1860), Hendrik Lorenz (1853-1928), its creator was Albert Einstein (1879-1955).

It is impossible to describe the whole modern point of view on structure and properties of matter, motion, space and time because this would mean the description of all achievements of modern science. We are going to deal only with the points necessary for philosophical understanding of matter moving in space and time.

According to modern views there are two opposite states of matter - substance and field, and this is the basis of the physical picture of the world. Substance, consists of elementary particles, nuclei of atoms, atoms, molecules, macroscopic

bodies of different dimensions, the Earth and other planets, stars, galaxies, metagalaxies, clusters of stars, etc. The characteristic feature of substance is mass at rest. Substance is discrete, intermittent, it consists of comparatively limited elements. Field is a specific state of matter which appears from the interaction of the corpuscles of substance. The interaction exists always and there are no corpuscles without interaction, therefore the field exists always too. Electromagnetic, gravitation, nuclei forces (both strong and weak) fields, fields corresponding to different particles can be referred to as physical fields. Fields also exist independently from the particles which create them. Fields diffuse in the form of waves. The maximum speed of diffusion is the speed of light, 300,000 km per hour.

Before the 20th century the field, electromagnetic one among others, was considered to be continuous unlike the intermittent corpuscles of substance. Later, Planck, Einstein and others have discovered the particles of fields, photon, for instance, is a particle of light. It was proved that fields consist of wave corpuscles, particles.

By applying the idea to the understanding of elementary particles of substance de Broglie has discovered their wave properties. It has become obvious that any corpuscle of substance - a planet, a stone, a molecule, an electron, etc., is an element of substance, and, at the same time, has wave properties the manifestation of which becomes the more noticeable the smaller the corpuscle is. Elementary particles have both wave and corpuscular properties. Thus the dialectical character of the basis of matter has been discovered -- the dual nature, the unity of opposites of particles of substance and fields, a corpuscle and a wave.

The progress of physics in the 20th century has become the major corroboration of the dialectical character of nature. Alongside the discovery of elementary particles (at present - more than 200), the antiparticles have been discovered. They have all properties of particles but with the inverse value of electromagnetic charge. It has been also discovered that particles of substance transform into each other, and particles of substance transform into fields and the other

way round, that there exists the phenomenon of the growth of the mass of an elementary particle corresponding to the growth of the speed of its motion, which demonstrated that matter and motion are indissolubly linked. The interactions of elementary particles and fields with space and time are being researched.

Lenin, who closely followed the progress in natural science, pointed out that new discoveries of science uncover the objective dialectics of nature, corroborate the basic principles worked out by Marx and Engels. In his article "Three Sources and Three Component Parts of Marxism (1913) he wrote: "The latest discoveries of natural science - radium, electrons, the transmutation of elements - have been a remarkable confirmation of Marx's dialectical materialism."¹ He returns to the subject in his work "Karl Marx" (1914) and points out that the progress of natural science goes along the lines foretold by the founders of Marxism. He quotes Engels to the effect that "Nature is the proof of dialectics, and it must be said for modern natural science that it has furnished extremely rich and daily increasing materials for this test, and has proved that in the last analysis Nature's process is dialectical and not metaphysical," and adds: "This was written before the discovery of radium, electrons, the transmutation of elements, etc.!"²

The progress of natural science in the 20th century has uncovered dialectics in the field of motion of matter, energy processes. The discovery of interconnection of the mass of elementary particles and the speed of their motion, the elaboration by Einstein of the law of interconnection of the mass of substance and the energy contained by it, etc. corroborated the principle of materialism that motion is the mode of the existence of matter by the concrete scientific material. In the course of studying the processes of motion in microcosm a new class of the laws of motion has been discovered. There was a dominating view in classical mechanics that all laws

1. V.I. Lenin, Collected Works, Vol. 19, p. 24

2. V.I. Lenin, Collected Works, Vol. 21, p. 53.

function in such a way that the effect is always precise and synonymously corresponds to its cause. While studying the motion of elementary particles it has been found out that this cause and effect interconnection does not take place in microcosm. The research has manifested that similar causes (impulse and direction) bring about different effects, that effects correspond to their causes only with certain degree of probability. Probable and statistical objective laws which include dialectical interconnection of necessity and accidentalness, probability and reality, cause, necessary conditions and effect, function in microcosm.

The study of space and time has greatly influenced the formation of modern dialectical materialist picture of the world. The theory of relativity and quantum mechanics have considerably developed the notion of relative character of space and time. As it was stated, dialectical materialism of Marx and Engels has manifested that each form of motion of matter has its own individual spatial-temporal characteristics. Modern science has elaborated this conception in a concrete way in connection with the study of the motion of material systems. It has been shown that space and time of material systems change in accordance with the speed of motion of the systems. This is most obvious at the velocities approaching the speed of light. At the same time the interconnection of space and time has been discovered. This connection is an inverse proportion. The following examples explain this point.

Supposing two systems are moving in relation to each other with the speed approaching the speed of light. We are in one of the systems. If we take a rod one metre long and throw it into the other system, it will move there with the speed close to the speed of light, then from our point of view its length will be less than one metre. The same change takes place in case of time. Let's take two persons of the same age. If one of them is replaced to another system for one year, on his return he will find out that his counterpart has lived several decades in our system and is old enough to be his father. Thus time expands and space diminishes at the speed approaching the speed of light. The interconnection of

space and time is so organic that according to modern scientific data it would be wrong to speak of space and time as of two forms of the existence of matter. It would be more correct to speak of space-time as of one characteristic of the world. The world has four dimensions - three spatial dimensions and one temporal dimension.

The theory of relativity has also demonstrated that the whole of spatial-temporal metric is stipulated by the gravitation field of material masses. For instance, close to enormous clusters of stars the space is curved towards the dominating mass. Due to the uneven distribution of material masses in the Universe space and time can have various metrics -- concave, spherical, spiral and others. From here follows the understanding of finiteness and infinity of space-time. As far back as the 19th century dialectics pointed out the unity of infinity and finiteness. Modern science made the conception far more concrete. In the field of enormous gravitating masses the space would be so curved that it would form a certain closed sphere, and any motion to exit the sphere would be the motion along the closed curve inside the sphere. In order to break away from the limits of this space it is necessary to overcome the gravitation of the said mass. Observations show that there exist in the Universe such masses of gravitation, that they would not let out even light from their limits. That is why such parts of the Universe are called "Black Holes". Space in such closed spheres is considered to be finite. But this finiteness is relative because there exist the infinite multitude of such spheres.

The problem of finiteness and infinity of time is examined the same way. The research shows that the observed part of the Universe is expanding, the stars, galaxies, clusters of stars move away from the centre of our Galaxy at enormous speed. It is possible to calculate the approximate start of this movement from the initial state if we know the distance and the speed of motion. The calculations show that the observed part of the Universe was in the compressed state about 10 to 18 billion years ago. The beginning of the expansion was the beginning of life of our part of the Universe. The research also shows that at a certain stage the reverse

process, the compression, will begin. The return to the initial state will be the end of the life-time of our part of the Universe. The Universe pulsates. The same processes take place in other parts of the Universe. Thus, time is finite in relation to certain pulsating systems but absolutely it is infinite.

The pulsation of our part of the Universe is not supernatural or exclusive. Scientists prove that new stars are born now also. They are formed through the explosion of the pre-stellar substance consisting of tightly compressed elementary particles, the forces of their interaction lead to mutual repulsion.

Thus modern science have uncovered the dialectical character of the basic phenomena, processes, subjects of nature observed by men, and corroborated Lenin's prevision.

However, the proliferation of dialectics in natural science is not an easy process, it is not free from deviations, from some idealistic, religious and even reactionary doctrines. And this is true not only of the period of the radical break-up of the old principles under the impact of new scientific discoveries in the beginning of the 20th century. The progress of science in the run of the 20th century is accompanied by the struggle against various unscientific conceptions which sometimes are evolved by the scientists who are well known in science. This is mainly due to the ignorance in dialectics and to the identification of materialism with its obsolete form of metaphysical mechanistic materialism which has been long ago refuted.

The attempt to interpret motion taken separately from matter took place as far back as 17th-18th centuries when scientists tried to prove that some preternatural force had given an initial impulse to matter. In the beginning of the 20th century a German physicist Wilhelm Ostwald (1853-1932) tried to prove that energy is something primary as compared to matter. The energism of Ostwald was convincingly criticised by Lenin in his work Materialism and Empirio-Criticism. He said that motion without matter is a pure motion, it is a motion without something to move, it is actually a pure thought of motion, but not motion itself. Energism

went on parasitising at the expence of the latest achievements of science. The discovery of the fact that the mass of an electron grows with the growth of its velocity was interpreted as motion giving birth to matter, as transformation of energy into matter. Einstein's formula of interconnection of mass and energy was used by some philosophers and physicists in the same way. Such conceptions are based on identification of mass with matter, substance with matter. As it was shown above dialectical materialism had long since proved that matter is the totality of objective reality. Mass, energy are the attributes, inseparable properties of matter which transform into each other and thus prove the fact that matter is not a creation and that it is indestructible.

The relapses of idealism are also due to the erroneous interpretation of the fact that the collision of a positron and an electron causes their disappearance and the formation of two photons. This was called the annihilation of matter, the disappearance of matter. In reality what we have here is the process of transformation of one state of matter (substance) into another (field).

Many attempts have been made to corroborate idealism by the achievements of the theory of relativity. To some extent they were caused by Einstein himself who, when explaining the theory of relativity of space and time, used the words "from the point of view of observers" with methodological purposes and said that from the point of view of an observer in one system the space and time would have one characteristic, but from the point of view of an observer in another system the same space and time would have another characteristic. The followers of Neo-Kantianism interpreted this in such a way that the observers create the spatial-temporal characteristic. Einstein himself refuted such notion by saying: "Such an assertion would be considered a joke by any expert."¹ He also said elsewhere: "There exists a certain real state of a physical system independent of all observations and measurements. No

¹. A. Einstein, Physics and Reality, Collected Papers, p. 253.

one, for instance, will doubt that the centre of gravity of the Moon takes a certain position at a certain moment even in the absence of a real or potential observer.¹ These statements by the great scientist remind us of Lenin's words spoken several decades before Einstein: "Recognising the existence of objective reality, i.e., matter in motion, independently of our mind, materialism must also inevitably recognise the objective reality of time and space, in contrast above all to Kantianism, which in this question sides with idealism and regards time and space not as objective realities but as forms of human understanding."²

The dialectical materialist doctrine of matter, motion, space and time is an organic part of the modern scientific understanding of the objective material world, it serves the methodological basis of further progress of human cognition, of the progress from ignorance to knowledge, from incomplete knowledge to better knowledge, helps to discover the objective dialectics of material processes and develop human abilities to master nature and society theoretically and practically.

2. Consciousness, Its Origin and Essence

The basic question of philosophy, as it has been stated in the introduction, is the question of the relation of thinking to being; spirit to nature, consciousness to matter. The materialist solution of the question consists in the proof of the fact that consciousness is a derivative of matter, that consciousness is one of the specific manifestations of the social form of the motion of matter. The mystery of consciousness, its essence and origin has always been the object of close attention of outstanding scientists, philosophers, thinkers. During the centuries-old history of studying consciousness many important generalisations have been made. In their struggle with various anti-scientific conceptions, the science and practice of experiment have come to the final

1. A. Einstein, Physics and Reality, Collected Papers, p. 78
2. V.I. Lenin, Collected Works, Vol. 14, p. 175.

conclusion that the organ of thinking is human brain consisting of 14 billion cells each of which is interconnected with the others. In the process of thinking the cells are irritated, activated or disactivated; action potentials, peculiar electric charges, etc., go through the thinking brain. The average weight of the brain of an adult person is 1,470 grammes, its volume is 1,456 cubical centimetres, the thinking abilities of human beings do not depend on the weight or the volume of the brain.

The destruction of cells or cellular connections brings about serious disturbances in mental abilities of a person and his moral state. This is one of the most convincing arguments against various conceptions of preternatural character of consciousness, immortality of spirit, etc.

Scientific research discovers the chemical composition of cerebral cells and the changes in their composition connected with various mental states, the influence of certain chemical compounds upon human mentality when such compounds are introduced into the brain. The chemical compounds which, figuratively speaking, record the information in human mind are being studied, in other words, the biochemical basis of memory is being revealed. 27

However, all this is biochemical, physiological, material basis of consciousness but not consciousness proper -- notions, conceptions, knowledge, dreams, etc. Consciousness proper has not yet been studied well enough though various fields of science continue to study consciousness. Great advances have been made by philosophy, the philosophy of dialectical and historical materialism in particular, in the study of the phenomenon of consciousness, and the latter utilised the achievements of both modern science and the previous philosophic thought.

The Problem of Consciousness in the History of Philosophy

Attempts were made to understand the nature of mental processes, to analyse various emotional experiences, the feel-

The solution of the problem of consciousness is connected with the solution of the basic question of philosophy. Already in ancient Indian philosophy

ings of love and dislike, joy and suffering, pride and humiliation. Ancient Indian materialist Brihaspati stated that life originated from matter and that emotional experiences are inherent in human body. A great achievement of ancient Indian philosophy was the fact that it turned to the analysis of human ego. Philosophers pointed out the polysemantic character of the word "ego", underlined its generalised meaning, took it for the expression of the multitude of characteristics of a body. From here they came to the conclusion that when a human body died its "ego" died too, hence, consciousness disappeared. Such speculation was an important argument against religious idealist doctrines.

Ancient Chinese philosophy paid great attention to the study of the processes of cognition, the laws of the logics of thought and thus drew attention to mental processes as being specific and different from those of nature.

Ancient Greek philosophers thought that consciousness, which they called "soul", something different from the phenomena and processes observed in nature. Their major attention was paid to the study of the essence of consciousness, its specific characteristics. Plato was the first in the history of philosophy who pointed out the ideal immaterial nature of consciousness and said that a thought is comprised of ideas. He made this side of consciousness an absolute and interpreted ideas as something primary to the totality of the material world, as the foundation of the world. In his struggle against Plato's idealism Democritus, being a materialist, asserted that the soul which he identified with consciousness consisted of tiniest atoms, in other words was material.

An important achievement of Arab philosophy at the end of the first millennium and the beginning of the second millennium A.D. was a special proof of the fact that consciousness is localised in the brain; great attention was paid to the study of objective laws of mental processes. To a large extent this was connected with the study of the heritage of an ancient Greek philosopher Aristotle who had elaborated basic schemes and figures of thought. Arab philosophy continued to develop Aristotle's logics and made its contribution to this field of knowledge.

European mediaeval thought being under the influence of religion and the church looked upon consciousness, which most often was called the soul, as "a smouldering spark," "reflection" of the divine mind. These notions were later developed in idealist philosophy of the new time, which by using intricate philosophic speculations, tried to prove that the world's mind, or the absolute idea, created the material world observed by us, and that human thought is only a specific form of existence of the world's mind.

Materialist philosophers or those who wavered between materialism and idealism made certain advances in the analysis of consciousness. Descartes asserted that man has to substances, material and spiritual, and the spiritual one ultimately ascends to God. At the same time he tried to study mental processes and became one of the founders of physiology.

Spinoza considered thought to be an attribute of substance alongside such attributes as length. The doctrine of unified substance and its two attributes was a blow to traditional conceptions of all religions of God as some spiritual force which created the material world. Consciousness of any man from Spinoza's point of view is the manifestation of the substantial attribute.

Much was contributed by French materialists of the 18th century to the understanding of consciousness. Within the limits of scientific capabilities of their time they convincingly proved that consciousness is the reflection of objective material world. According to them, human consciousness is notions, images, specific imprints of the objectively existing objects, things, processes. Holbach wrote: "Successive modifications of our brain caused by the action of things on our sense organs become causes themselves and engender new modifications in our soul which are called thoughts, meditations, memory, imagination, judgements, wishes, and actions, all of which have the same basis-sensation."¹ The explanation of consciousness as reflection became the basis for the development of another concept of consciousness being secondary in

1. P. Holbach, The System of Nature, p. 303.

relations to nature surrounding man. This was of great importance in the struggle of materialists against idealist doctrines.

An important step forward in the study of consciousness was made by Russian materialists of the 19th century. Pointing out that consciousness is secondary to matter they proved that it is the result of the development of nature. Alexander Herzen (1812-1870) stated that "consciousness is not foreign to nature, it is but the supreme stage of its development.¹" Russian materialist philosophy paid great attention to the corroboration of the fact that the organ of thinking is human brain, which is a material body organized in a specific way. Thus philosophy contributed greatly to the emergence of physiology in Russia as a special field of natural science studying the material basis of thought. The founders of the Russian school of physiology were Ivan Sechenov (1820-1905) and Ivan Pavlov. Their works became the natural science basis for the materialist solution of the problems of consciousness.

Thinking much of the doctrines of the old materialists on consciousness we have to point out that they had considerable drawbacks. Here we refer to the fact that above all they failed to explain the origin of consciousness. The old materialists stuck to metaphysics, they were not able to grasp the processes of development, qualitative changes in nature. That is why pre-Marxian materialists mainly limited themselves to stating the fact that (consciousness was the exclusive ability of a human being which distinguishes him from an animal.)

A serious drawback in the teaching of the old materialists about consciousness was their concept of reflection being a passive process, a simple observation, mechanical, mirror-like reflection. An active creative component of consciousness was not taken into account. That is why it so happened that the creative component of man's consciousness has been studied by idealism but in such a way that consciousness was presented as a kind of primary matter, a source of all the existing, a prime basis of the world, or its creator.

1. A.I. Herzen, Collected Works, Vol. III, Moscow, 1954, pp. 126-127 (in Russian).

Such an absolutisation of consciousness was most characteristic of German idealist philosophers Fichte (1762-1814) and Hegel (1770-1831).

These shortcomings along with some other weak points of old materialism were removed by Marx and Engels, the founders of dialectical materialist teaching of consciousness and its scientific analysis methodology. The propositions of Marx and Engels were further developed by Lenin.

The origin of consciousness
Origin of Consciousness problem was a stumbling-block for all metaphysical philosophy. This philosophy failed to understand the laws of material world development, and went to either of two extremes; it refused to solve the problem, just indicating that consciousness is a property of a human being, or arrived at the so-called hylozoism, i.e., philosophical teaching that all matter is animate. In this case such absurd conclusions were drawn as, for example, according to French philosopher materialist Robine, a stone can also think but much worse than a man.

It was only as a result of creation of dialectical and historical materialism by Marx and Engels, revealing the laws of development, qualitative transformation of phenomena and processes in nature and society, that the problem of the origin of consciousness could be solved.

According to Marx, Engels and Lenin, the origin of consciousness is governed by two major prerequisites: natural and social.

Natural prerequisites of consciousness origin are developed in Lenin's theory of reflection. In his book Imperialism and Empirio-Criticism Lenin writes: "It is logical to assert that all matter possesses a property which is essentially akin to sensation, the property of reflection."¹

The classics of Marxism-Leninism have criticised hylozoism which ascribed thinking capacity to all matter. But at

1. V.I. Lenin, Collected Works, Vol. 14, p. 92.

the same time they considered that consciousness does not appear from void. Matter has a certain property, which in the process of development takes a shape of thinking. Using the latest achievements of natural science of the beginning of the 20th century, Lenin drew the conclusion that all matter has a property of reflection. Lenin proved that the concept of "reflection" is much broader than that of "consciousness" while the latter is the highest stage in the development of the former.

What is reflection? Reflection is a general property of matter to reproduce and fix the properties inherent in the reflected object. Reflection may be defined as the ability of bodies to reflect internally the properties of other bodies acting upon them. The definition is not quite exact, but it helps to distinguish between the philosophical and other notions of reflection. Besides that it has a certain degree of generalisation, because it embraces both elemental and higher forms of reflection, i.e., sensations and consciousness.

Some simple examples are given for illustration of the above said. When a person walks in sand, footprints are left. The footprints are a reflection of his foot. During excavations the scientists find prints of extinct animals and plants. This is also reflection. Smooth water surface also reflects trees and shrubs, surrounding the pool. Metal body expansion at heating reflects the ambient temperature rise.

These are all processes of reflection, and we come across them daily in our life. All the examples given above are illustrating inorganic, inanimate nature. But with the development of matter, with its transition from one form of motion to another, the process of reflection also becomes more complicated. The simplest type of reflection, inherent in organic matter, i.e., the plants and primitive animate bodies - is irritability. Irritability is expressed, for example, when a sunflower follows the sun, when a jelly-fish moves to the light, etc.

Higher organisms have still more complicated forms of reflection: sensation and perception.

The highest possible form of reflection in nature is a primitive thinking of such animals as monkey, dolphin, elephant,

dog, horse, hyena and some other. The monkey breed, from which human beings originated, also had that type of primitive thinking ability. But for origination of consciousness as the highest form of reflection and the property of characteristic of human being alone, special, i.e. social, conditions were necessary.

Social Conditions for the Origin of Consciousness

The problem of the origin of human being and his consciousness was dealt with by many scientists. Naturalists long

before Marx noted that the human being originated from the world of animals and explained it by historical evolutionary processes. They pointed out that due to climatic changes, environment also changes and this in its turn makes the animals adapt to the changing environmental conditions thus perfecting themselves.

That was the way the evolution went, during which the human being shaped. Even such an outstanding scientist as Darwin (1809-1882) kept to evolutionism analysing the problem of human origin. With such an approach the main question remained pending, i.e., the qualitative difference between man and primates.

By no means can we isolate the origin of human being from biological evolution. Several million years ago great climatic changes, followed by other changes, took place on our planet. For many primates those changes became a kind of ecological crisis, because they could not adjust their interaction with nature to the new conditions and thus failed to survive. Many species of animals did perish. Some of them changed their nature, way of life and thus managed to survive. Under those conditions apes -- the predecessors of human being, when losing the source of ready natural food, started to change or transform the objects found in wild nature so they would help them to meet their requirements. A qualitatively new process came into being, i.e. living organism started to adapt the nature to its requirements. Thus labour appeared, which is an activity aimed at nature transformation, specific feature of man and the basis for his development. Thus labour served as a specific means of over-

coming the ecological crisis. In the historical process of solving the ecological problem man was formed and shaped.

During labour activity, as Marx pointed out, man influencing upon and transforming environment "at the same time changes his own nature",¹ i.e. in the course of labour activity man modifies and develops with the development of man's consciousness predominating. Classics of Marxism pointed out that labour is of such an importance that it may be said: "Labour created the man himself".

Human consciousness originated in the process of labour in the following way.

For finding a necessary object in nature it is enough to be able to reflect the external, visible side of the objects. Even animals are capable of this. But to modify the natural object and purposely adapt it to a specific requirement, the above said ability is insufficient. It is necessary for this purpose to reflect the inner side of the objects, their law and foundation. In the course of numerous attempts to modify the objects in the run of historically long period of time anthropoid ape developed the ability of abstract thinking, i.e. to reflect the inner essential properties of natural objects. Abstract thinking originates when the anthropoids start to create and make use of labour tools. To explain the way the abstract thinking appears with utilisation of instruments of labour let us see the mental process. Prior to using the labour tools in getting the food two forms of reflection had an established connection in the brain: representation of requirement — representation of the required object. But when the anthropoid ape starts using the tool a third interconnecting link appears in the chain between the former two, i.e. labour tool reflection. A tool is such an object, which is not good for immediate satisfaction of the requirement. It is not like the requirement or the object of requirement. But at the same time its representation includes particular features of both.

Let us see closer the essence of this third link, i.e., the tool. Let it be a stick, by means of which the anthropo-

¹ K. Marx, Capital, Vol. I, Progress Publishers, 1974, p.173.

id ape reaches for banana. The stick itself is not a tool yet. It becomes a tool only when it is found between the hand and the banana with the purpose of reaching for the latter. The same is true about the reflection of the stick in the brain as its representation. Such representation by itself is not a representation of a tool. Its representation becomes the representation of the tool when in the brain it is placed between the other two representations, i.e. food requirement and banana. But when the representation of a stick is placed between the other two, it acquires a new quality. Now this representation includes some features of the adjacent two, which it links together: i.e. the nature of the requirement and banana properties, hand and banana, distance between them, etc. Under this condition alone the stick representation turns into the tool representation.

In the "tool" representation there is a quality not present in the "stick" representation, which appears only in the system of representations developed by man. It is from here that abstract thinking starts. It means presence and development of such representations, concepts and other forms of thinking, which are not a straightforward immediate reflection of real objects, but which forms as a result of mental establishment of major links between these simple images. Abstract thinking is a generalised reflection of the world, but at the same time it is a deeper reflection as compared to an immediate one, because the former may appear only during labour process.

The major role in establishment and development of consciousness is played by a working collective. Why labour is a collective process? It is because in the majority of cases transformation of the natural objects involved quite a number of various simultaneous operations, actions. One single individual can not cope with the task because of his limited anatomic and physiological capacities. That is why the anthropoid apes, shaping into human beings, from the very beginning joined into collectives in which the labour actions were divided between them.

Coordination of labour activities and transmission of information became a necessity in the process of collective

labour. Under the impact of this necessity there appeared language as a means of information transmission during the labour process. The information was to be transmitted and received quickly and accurately. This forced straining of intellectual efforts and training of newly appearing consciousness, thus developing it. Language is a means of presenting, storing and transmitting socially acquired information developed by society in the course of history.

Four major factors emerge historically simultaneously, have mutual effect on each other, facilitating their development, these are: labour, collective (society), language (speech), and consciousness. But the basis of the whole process is labour for consciousness and collective as well as language emerge to increase labour efficiency and on the basis of labour.

Historical development of labour and collective productive activity is permanently accompanied by the development of man's consciousness, which reflects ever deeper and more essential aspects of the objects and natural processes.

The Essence of Consciousness

Consciousness may be defined as a philosophical category for denoting the highest, ideal, creative reflection

of the world developed on the basis of labour.

Specific feature of consciousness is its ideal nature. The problem of ideal character of consciousness is a major topic of philosophical studies, and its wrong apprehension is one of the main roots of idealism. Idealists consider the ideal nature of consciousness as something absolute opposite to matter, existing externally and beyond matter and being the basis of all matter. Pre-Marxian materialism waged a struggle against absolutisation of consciousness ideality, but without knowledge of dialectics and understanding of man's social nature, it failed to explain the ideal character of the highest form of reflection. In the 19th century there was a trend in materialist philosophy to negate the ideal character of consciousness and to explain it as a purely material process, as some liquid substance emitted from the brain. But this trend did not find supporters among the philosophers.

Scientific explanation of consciousness' ideal nature was given only by dialectical and historical materialism.

When speaking about ideal one usually thinks of something immaterial, existing not in the real world, but in imagination alone.

But at the same time dialectical materialism does not separate consciousness from matter, does not intend to oppose it to matter absolutely. Lenin wrote: "The antithesis of matter and mind has absolute significance only within the bounds of a very limited field -- in this case exclusively within the bounds of the fundamental epistemological problem of what is to be regarded as primary and what as secondary. Beyond these bounds the relative character of this antithesis is indubitable."¹

Consciousness is a property of brain to reflect the objective material world. Being the property of brain, consciousness belongs to matter and in this respect it is absurd to oppose it to matter. But reflecting it in the ideal form of thought, consciousness is opposite to matter, different from it. But even in this respect consciousness is not fully independent of matter, as its essence is in fact a reflection of material world, and its content is predetermined by the material world. Having in mind consciousness belonging to matter Engels pointed out, that motion of matter includes in itself mental processes.²

For revealing the ideal essence of consciousness it is necessary to pay attention not to the common features of consciousness and matter, but on their difference. Consciousness is idea in its main aspects: both in its origin and its essence. Its ideal character is created by labour, by activity aimed at nature transformation using the labour tools. Let us see the essence of consciousness' ideal character and the process of its formation. Reflective processes typical of animals are of sensuous-psychological nature. The animal's brain reproduces biochemically and physiologically external, directly observed aspects of individual things, acting upon

1. V.I. Lenin, Collected Works, Vol. 14, p. 147.

their sense organs. On the contrary man's consciousness reflects the inner, important aspects and common properties of things and processes.

The difficulty in understanding the ideal character is that it reflects things, processes, such peculiarities of the objective world which are not sensuously perceived. English classical materialism postulate, "There is nothing new in the intellect as compared to what previously existed in sensations and senses (nihil est in intellectu quod non fuerit in sensu)" is basically wrong. Man's consciousness as reflection of processes appearing in the cause of labour, as reflection of essence, reflection of common features in a multitude of individual phenomena, contains that which has no direct impact on sense organs. By this reason consciousness is of ideal nature. Now we shall explain this general statement in more detail.

Forms of Abstract Thinking

In labour activity with utilisation of tools abstract thinking develops, i.e. such mental images, which reflect first of all labour tools not as things sensually perceived, but as a meaning of these things, the role they play and the functions they perform in the labour process. A stick the ape uses to reach a banana is a tool only when it is used in the labour process. Out of the process it is no longer a tool but just an object in nature. It should be noted that the object may be used as a tool without any alterations to it. "Tool" is not a specific natural thing, but a relation, purpose, role or function performed by an ordinary thing, used as a tool in labour process. "Living labour," Marx says, "must seize upon these things and rouse them from their death-sleep, change them from mere possible use-values into real and effective ones. Bathed in the fire of labour, appropriated as part and parcel of labour's organism, and, as it were, made alive for the performance of their functions in the process, they are in truth consumed ... as new products."¹

1. Karl Marx, Capital, Vol. I, p. 178.

Thus in labour process such realities appear, that do not exist out of the process, objectively or sensually. They are formed in labour process proper and are reflected in the consciousness, not in a material space-time shape but rather in ideal form as a notion of the relation, value, function and role the particular thing plays in the labour process.

The notion of labour tool was historically the first ideal form of thought to appear in labour process. At the early stage of formation of man's consciousness the ideal notions vanished when the natural thing was no longer used as a labour tool. Similar practice is observed now in the experiments with the apes. For a long historical period of development these notions were gradually fixed in the brain, and kept there for a longer and longer time. It was the historical process of the formation of human consciousness. It should also be added that such fixing of "tool" notion was associated directly with practical fixing of tool properties in things, i.e. along with the historical process of creating the tools, first in individual cases and then systematically, from simple to more complicated. The tools created by man, i.e. axe, machine, computer, are materialised relation of people to nature and to each other. As such, objectively, out of labour process and without fixing in human consciousness as tools these are not tools, but a heap of metal. And it is in such a way that they are perceived by animals, i.e. creatures having no ideal images of the objects.

In the cause of labour activity the range of ideal expands, it embraces also the objects transformed. And the mental shapes, reflecting the essence of the transformed things, are not shaped by themselves, but in the process of labour and on the basis of those mental shapes which reproduce the labour tools, because the latter are the materialised relation of people to things and comprise the possibility of acting upon the essence of the things. In the labour process the tools are as if leading human thought, which, according to Lenin, "goes endlessly deeper from appearance to essence...".¹

1. V.I. Lenin, Collected Works, Vol. 38, p. 253.

What is the nature of the thought shapes which reflect the essence of the transformed things? It is also governed by the nature of tools. The notion "tool" has always a generalised character. Thus for example the most primitive sharpened stick for digging out the roots is of a general purpose character, because it may be used to dig out not only this particular root but a similar one too, i.e. the tool may be adjusted for digging out the roots which are similar to each other.

Thus the "tool" notion not only reflects the essence of a given tool as a single thing, but it reflects the generalised essence. In its turn, the essential component in things, upon which man's influence is exercised in labour process, is also not singular but also general. Thus the shapes of thought, in which the essence of the transformed things is reflected, is also a generalised character.

But the general as such does not really exist in the sensually perceived form. In reality there are separate single things, having common features. "The universal," Lenin wrote, "exists only in the individual and through the individual."¹ Individual things are perceived by the senses, universal things are perceived by the thought, "the universal is a thought,"² Lenin notes. Man's thinking embraces the general in the individual, extracts it, abstracts it and shapes the form of thought having a generalised character. The general exists in thought in its pure form, and as such and in this sense it is ideal.

The ideal cannot be reproduced by some sensually perceived material forms and means. Under this condition it is no longer ideal. The only way of expressing the ideal is the word, speech. As far as the ideal is always general the words are also having a generalised character. "Every word (speech)," Lenin wrote, "already universalises."³ And further: "In langu-

1. V.I. Lenin, Collected Works, Vol. 38, p. 361.

2. Ibid., p. 278.

3. Ibid., p. 274.

age there is only the universal.¹ This ideal and generalised character of thought and word differentiates them from material, individual sensual reality perception. "The senses show reality," Lenin says, "thought and word -- the universal."²

Question may arise about the ideal character of thought about singular things, i.e. the Sun, the Moon, the given table, etc. Lenin analysed the problem: "To call by name? -- but the name is a contingent symbol and does not express Sache selbst /the very essence of the thing/ (how can the particular be expressed?)."³

The solution of the problem Lenin saw in comparison. "One of the objects of a given kind (tables) is distinguished by something from the rest."⁴

The thought about the particular (e.g. the Sun) is also ideal due to generalisation, but its generalised character is formed by the difference from the other things (the Earth, the Moon) rather than by features in common, i.e. the ideal thought about the particular is in one way or another interconnected with other thoughts and included in the system of the ideal.

Sensual data are processed and transformed by analysis and synthesis, abstraction and generalisation, the result being the ideal forms of thought. "The ideal," Marx wrote, ("is nothing else than the material world reflected by the human mind, and translated into forms of thought."⁵)

The forms of thought are ideal because they are not an individual reflection of the world, but a social one.) Ideal-general notions of labour tools, transformed things, etc., appear, form and develop only in the collective social labour and their existence is maintained by the fact that their meaning is generally accepted and represents the relations between people in society; society is its bearer, not an individual.

1. V.I. Lenin, Collected Works, Vol. 38, p. 277.

2. Ibid., p. 274. The interconnection between consciousness and language is dealt with in more detail in Part III.

3. Ibid., p. 278.

4. Ibid., p. 276.

5. K. Marx, Capital, Vol. I, p. 29.

Idealist philosophy points out specifically the value of the ideal forms of thought and tries to represent them as characters, symbols, hieroglyphs of things, rather than the reflection of the things proper. Such explanations were given by Machists and other subjective idealists. According to them, the essence, the content of the objective things is beyond our understanding, being incognitive. Lenin strongly opposed this idea, saying that "'conventional sign', symbol, hieroglyph are concepts which introduce an entirely unnecessary element of agnosticism."¹

Ideal notion is an image, meaningful reproduction of essence of objectively existing things. "The image," Lenin noted, "inevitably and of necessity implies the objective reality of that which it 'imagines'."² The forms of our thinking are the images of the things. And the images should not be taken as something existing parallel to the objective things, as some other sphere existing alongside the sphere of things. Images shall not be taken away from the process of man's understanding of the objective world. An image of a thing is neither the thing proper and not a source object of cognition nor a sign of the thing. The image of a thing is an ideal reflection of an objective thing.

To summarise the above said, a short definition may be given: the ideal is an essentially generalised reflection of people's relation to nature and to each other by social consciousness.

Showing the difference between the ideal and the material, conscious and sensual-objective one should not go too far in separating them. Lenin wrote: "The difference of the ideal from the material is also not unconditional, not uberschwenglich."³ The ideal and the material are closely interconnected. The ideal is of secondary, derivative nature, it is a result of the material development and its reflection. But the ideal in its turn has a countereffect upon the

1. V.I. Lenin, Collected Works, Vol. 14, p. 235.

2. Ibid.

3. V.I. Lenin, Collected Works, Vol. 38, p. 114.

material processes, upon the reality. Marx wrote, that it is the ideal world "which always wells up out of the real world and flows back into it with ever greater spiritual riches and renews its soul."¹

The surrounding reality is reflected in man's consciousness "ideally, in the shape of a ... plan"² and the plan turns into a kind of model for purposeful actions taken by man. "At the end of every labour-process, we get a result that already existed in the imagination of the labourer at its commencement."³

In the revolutionary practice the success depends mainly on the masses upbringing, on having a clear plan of activity in their consciousness, on thorough understanding of immediate and long-term purposes and the ways of revolutionary struggle.

Differentiation of Consciousness

Consciousness as an ideal reflection of the material world is not single and inseparable one. "Consciousness..."⁴ Marx points out, "is therefore the totality of its moments."⁴ Further detailed consciousness characteristics is to reveal these aspects.

Aspect one: consciousness is knowledge. Marx says: "The way in which consciousness is, and in which something is for it, is knowing."⁵ We have mentioned before that consciousness is primarily the reflection of the surrounding objects, i.e. knowing them. There is no consciousness unless there is knowledge. Knowledge is a way of living, existence of consciousness. But on the other hand, an object also exists for consciousness (not exists in general, but exists for a conscious man) only in such a way that it can be reflected in consciousness. Real objects are reflected in man's consciousness.

1. K. Marx and F. Engels, Collected Works, Vol. 1, p. 165.
2. K. Marx, Capital, Vol. I, p. 314.

3. K. Marx, Capital, Vol. I, p. 174.

4. K. Marx, and F. Engels, Collected Works, Vol. 3, p. 335
5. Ibid., p. 338.

ness as notions, representations, hypotheses, theories and various teachings. Knowledge may be pre-scientific (life experience) and scientific, e.g. knowledge of mythology, artistic knowledge, etc. Knowledge concentrates accumulated experience of man and effects systematisation of scattered information and images. This is necessary for practical activity at a given moment as a support for further development of both knowledge and social practice.

Aspect two: consciousness is a self-consciousness. Consciousness does not only reflect the external world, existing outwardly and objectively, but itself reflects man himself, his inner mental life. A man visualises himself as being distinct from the surrounding world, as a subject directly opposed to object. "Consciousness (das Bewusstsein) can never be anything else than conscious being (das bewusste Sein), and the being of men is their actual life-process."¹ Self-consciousness is a self-evaluation of man, assessment of his own behaviour, morality, ideals and interests, i.e. in self-consciousness man learns and reflects his own essence. Marx says: "The man who takes hold of his essential being is merely the self-consciousness."² In his self-consciousness man as it views himself from aside, checks himself, his behaviour, makes comparison of his actions, and thereby himself, with the people's actions, perceives himself in the general context of changing situation. Animals do have some primitive-sensual knowledge (they know, for example, their master, their house, etc.), but they do not have self-consciousness, which is specific for man alone. Animals are directly involved in the system of natural processes, being its part. Man, due to labour and utilisation of labour tools, is indirectly participating in the process, singles himself out from nature, counterposes to it and thus perceives himself as something different from nature. He mentally subdivides the world into two parts -- "Self" as a mental centre of human personality and "non-self", i.e. all the rest, around "Self". Due to self-consciousness man

1. K. Marx and F. Engels, Collected Works, Vol. 5, p. 36.

2. Ibid., Vol. 3, p. 334.

controls his actions as if looking at his Self within the surrounding world as a whole.

Self-consciousness is a result of high level of consciousness development. At an early stage of man development consciousness was mainly represented by knowledge. And it is only gradually that self-consciousness is forming on the basis of knowledge. The process of self-consciousness formation is a process of moulding a personality, i.e. formation of a stable system of socially-meaningful features, specific of an individual being a member of a collective or society.

Aspect three: consciousness is emotions. Emotions are towering above consciousness and self-consciousness. Besides just having consciousness and self-consciousness, man treats them not indifferently, but in a certain way. Man may be happy or scared, to love or to hate, to feel self-respect or humiliation and offence -- all that is a result of his awareness of the outer world or self-perception. These are emotions, having numerous shades, tints and complicated feelings, too complicated to be characterised by words./

Man's emotions are outwardly similar to certain psychic responses of animals. For this reason it is sometimes said that animals have emotions too. But in fact, man watching animals' responses, evaluates them analogously to his own emotions. Man's emotions do appear and develop only on the basis of labour as an attitude towards the labour process and its results as well as his attitude to the labour collective, to society. When speaking specifically of labour significance in the social activity, Marx points out: "The senses of the social man differ from those of the non-social man. Only through the objectively unfolded richness of man's essential being is the richness of subjective human sensibility .. either cultivated or brought into being."¹

Man directs his emotions at important socially-meaningful phenomena, moulds his attitude and systems of actions to be taken in relation to these phenomena.

Aspect four: consciousness is imagination. Man's consci-

1. K. Marx and F. Engels, Collected Works, Vol. 3, p. 301.

ousness is of creative nature, it produces such notions, images, such a system of mental forms, which are not a direct reflection of definite objects or phenomena of reality.] This capability has developed in man as early as in ancient times, when man failing to find a ready object in nature to meet his requirements tried to alter natural objects. Imagination appeared as a result of discrepancy between the existing necessity and objects, existing in nature to meet the requirements. Stimulated by vital necessity man worked out an image of an object required for his purposes. Having this image in mind, man took it as a sample while modifying natural objects, altered them according to the image. Imagination is a capacity of consciousness to combine mental images and their elements into new systems, having no analogue in reality.

Imagination, developing with sophistication of labour process and social relations, became a major aspect of man's consciousness and activity. Imagination's main function is to imagine ideally the result of activity prior to its completion in reality. Imagination plays the role of a determinant factor controlling the order and sequence of labour actions. "A spider conducts operations that resemble those of a weaver, and a bee puts to shame many an architect in the construction of her cells. But what distinguishes the worst architect from the best of bees is this, that the architect raises his structure in imagination before he erects it in reality."¹

(Imagination precedes what is not yet existing, but will or may be as a result of man's activity, social activity or alterations of natural processes. Man continues mentally the processes he knows and reflects in his consciousness. Generally speaking there is nothing in imagination that would not have any basis in reality. Imagination springs from such mental forms which are reflections of real, existing in reality objects and processes. But imagination places these mental forms (notions, images, etc.) in new, non-existing relations and connections, creating mentally unprecedent structures, systems and processes. Psychology classifies imagination by

1. Karl Marx, Capital, Vol. I, p. 174.

various features: the degree of purposefulness -- voluntary and involuntary; by activity -- reproducing and creative; by image generalisation - specific and abstract; by the types of creative activity - scientific, inventive, artistic, religious, etc. Imagination is a necessary prerequisite of purposeful, creative activity.

Aspect five: consciousness is will. As we have already mentioned the old materialists considered reflection to be a passive process. Marxism was the first to prove that consciousness is of an active will character. This postulation of dialectical materialism, developed by Marx and Engels in the middle of the 19th century, was further confirmed and developed in physiology and psychology.

Assuming that labour is the basis for creation and development of consciousness, Marx, Engels and Lenin revealed the consciousness is essentially of a practical nature. Man reflects the surrounding world selectively, choosing purposely from the whole lot of things, influencing his sense organs, only those which are of practical or vital importance for him. Will is a concentration of all mentality for solving a required task. Such a capacity has been worked out alongside the development of labour when man was faced with a necessity to interfere actively into the processes and objects of the surrounding world for transforming them. It should be remembered that the main elements comprising in their totality human consciousness may be isolated only for the purpose of their studying, for providing better methods of their understanding. In reality all of them are interconnected and exerted influence upon each other, they never manifest themselves separately, and only in combination they may be called consciousness.

Social Character of Consciousness

present consciousness as something existing separately and independently of man's brain, existing outside, prior and without man. Moreover, according to objective idealism, the objectively existing consciousness, idea, spirit or absolute

Materialism throughout the whole history of philosophy waged a struggle against objective idealism, which tried to

reason creates and builds all the existing, including man himself.

What is the difficulty in understanding consciousness existence? What is the problem, which objective idealism solved in such a false way?

The matter is that consciousness exists in the brain of each particular individuum, is localised in his brain. But the question may arise, too difficult to be solved by all pre-Marxian philosophy: why all the people are thinking in the same manner, understand each other, can exchange knowledge, pass their knowledge to next generations, etc.? Why consciousness is common? In search of an answer to similar questions philosophers used to say about objectively existing consciousness outside man, about a preset harmony, about single consciousness as an attribute (inseparable property) of all matter and the like.

(Only Marxist philosophy, revealing the role of labour in creating man and man's consciousness,) could give a scientific answer to the above question.

Consciousness appears, shapes and develops on the basis of labour, which is a collective activity. It is in the collective that consciousness shapes not as a feature of an individual man, but as a feature of the collective or society as a whole. Consciousness is a fruit of collective, social activity, it belongs to society rather than to a single individuum. And man himself, educated in a collective, social labour is not an abstraction existing by itself; the essence of man, according to Marx, is a sum total of all social relations. Consequently consciousness by its nature is social and the foundation of its existence lies in society. That is why people understand each other, because consciousness is their common possession.

Thus consciousness is of a social nature, firstly, through its historical origin: it appeared as a result or fruit of collective labour; secondly, consciousness of an individuum is formed under the influence of society. Parents, family and other people by means of speech and various activities educate the child, develop his consciousness, share knowledge, shape self-consciousness, human emotions, etc.

(shaping of self-consciousness may be in a child illustrated by remembering its name and calling itself -- "myself", etc.). If a year or one-and-a-half-year old child stays among the animals, it copies the behaviour of the animals and does not develop any human properties. Over 50 cases are known in science when the children lived among the animals: wolves, monkeys, bears and some other animals. All the efforts of scientists to turn the children into human beings were in vain.

Thirdly, consciousness is social in its functioning. Any man's consciousness exists and develops through communication with other people, using the objects created by men, by men's labour, by the society. If an adult is deprived of all the contacts with the people and isolate him completely from all human surrounding for a long time the man gradually loses his conscious, humane qualities. Consciousness cannot exist and function only in a single man's brain.

Consciousness, being social by its nature, is strongly affected in its shaping by a specific social medium, which educates man, inculcating its interests, purposes, social standpoints, views, ideals, emotional evaluation of social events. That is why in a class society consciousness is of a class nature. Each class of society educates man in such a way that his consciousness would correspond to social standpoints of the given class. Ideological struggle is the struggle aimed at influencing man's consciousness. Communist parties are struggling, on the one hand, against penetration of bourgeois ideology into the consciousness of the working people and, on the other hand, for dissemination of Marxist-Leninist ideology which helps the people in their efforts to rearrange society to win freedom and social progress.

Modern bourgeois philosophy made a substantial evolution away from classical bourgeois philosophy of the 18th and 19th centuries. Last centuries philosophy of both objective idealist and subjective idealist trends considered consciousness as something completely independent of material world, counterposed to it and even being the foundation of the world. In the 20th century, with the development of natural science, physiology and psychology in particular, and with rapid proliferation of dialectical and historical materialism, bourgeois philosophy

has to look for another way to explain the consciousness existence and its sources. And one will never find a uniform approach or a common platform taken by various bourgeois philosophers on this particular problem as well as on many others. Pluralism is a characteristic feature of bourgeois philosophy, and its social aim is an ideological treatment of various classes and strata of society. But it is here that all the tasks, trends and concepts of bourgeois philosophy merge and become socially-oriented — they have got a common platform of idealism and anti-Marxism. It means that modern bourgeois philosophy is not far off from idealistic positions in its search of consciousness existence reasons.

Husserl (1859-1938), the founder of phenomenology, one of the most widely spread schools of the 20th century bourgeoisie philosophy, wrote that he was still looking for an absolutely reliable "point of support".¹ On the search of point of support E. Fink, a pupil of Husserl, wrote: "The idea of taking human mentality back to the prime sources of all knowledge is the chief motif of the phenomenological conception."²

The primary source of knowledge and consequently of consciousness is an intentionality, i.e. constant orientation of consciousness to an object, active, willful strive of consciousness to cognition. As far as the intentionality is taken as a basis of consciousness, it is also assumed to be the primary source of thought formation in consciousness and of ways of thinking. All the ways of thinking are taken to be the object to which consciousness is oriented. Thus consciousness is locked in itself, cognises the object it creates itself. This is subjective idealism, which absolutises the ✓ activity of man's consciousness, formed under the impact of labour social production activity of man. Phenomenology tends to limit the cognitive abilities of mind to divert man's attention and concentrate it on his feelings, to persuade him

1. Ed. Husserl, Erste Philosophie (1923-1924). Husserliana, Bd. 8, Den Haag, 1969, p. 69.

2. E. Fink, Das Problem der Phänomenologie Edmund Husserl's in der gegenwärtigen Kritik, "Kant-Studien", Hamburg-Berlin, 1933, p. 240.

that the objective world of social life is beyond understanding and cannot be purposefully affected.

Basic ideas of phenomenology became a philosophical foundation for another influential trend in modern bourgeois philosophy, i.e. existentialism.

One of the existentialism founders M. Heidegger (1889-1976) takes as a basis of consciousness the simplest forms of spontaneous, undeveloped, primitive consciousness expressed as "moods" rather than as clear comprehension. Other forms of thinking such as "reasoning", "theoretical consciousness", etc., according to him, are impure and not natural, but "infected" by values, and thus cannot be taken as initial basis. Values, brought into consciousness by society prevent from understanding the true existence of man. One should withdraw completely from the social build-up and deepen into initial, undeveloped forms of thinking which help to feel one's existence with all senses and wishes, presentiments and worries, doubts and hopes, troubles and needs. This initial archetype of man's consciousness included such main forms of thought as "care", "fright", "presentiment of death", "loneliness", "solitude", etc. True existence is existence in this consciousness. According to existentialism, it is senseless to speak about real objective existence, which influences consciousness and to which the latter corresponds. In 1950 one student wrote a letter to Heidegger, asking: "Wherefrom thinking of existence gets directives?" The philosopher answered: "Thinking of existence as of a definite correspondence is something very erroneous and therefore very miserable."¹ Philosophy should not deal with such a "scandalous matter" as proving the existence of the world outside consciousness, for consciousness is the world. Heidegger wrote that "scandal in philosophy consists not in the fact that no proof has been yet found of the outward world's existence, but in the fact that such proof is still expected to be found and attempts are made to

1. M. Heidegger, Vorträge und Aufsätze, Pfullingen, 1954,
p. 183.

find it."¹ Heidegger's views were further developed by his followers in some countries.

Existentialist teaching on consciousness is an expression of real state of bourgeois consciousness, full of fear and doubts, concern and trouble. Moreover, the philosophy tried to persuade that such a state is natural, basic, real state of man's consciousness and that the source of such a state is a human nature itself, rather than socio-economic reality of bourgeois society.

One of the most widely spread trends concerned with investigations on the nature of consciousness in modern philosophy is represented by "scientific materialism". The trend appeared in the 1960s in the USA and Australia under the influence of rapid development of physiology and psychology. The basic concept, developed in the works of D. Armstrong, T. Nagel, J. Smart, P. Feigle et al. implies that man's consciousness may be reduced to various states of CNS, to a working brain, and, consequently, the method of natural sciences, such as physics, may provide exhaustive description of human being. Spiritual aspects, according to "scientific materialists", are identical to physical ones and the former is a subcategory of the latter.

Possibility of a complete reduction of mental to physical in principle may be accurately proved by scientific experiments, that on the one hand cancels a traditional psycho-physical problem and on the other is a necessary condition for creating monistic ontological theory, the basis of a "single science".

Dialectical materialism is against such a simplified treatment of consciousness, neglecting its social nature, against explaining the consciousness as a physical or chemical process. "Scientific materialists", by reducing consciousness to just physical processes, give exclusively naturalistic treatment of consciousness, paying tribute to vulgar materialism.

1. M. Heidegger, *Sein und Zeit*, Halle, 1924, p. 205.

In modern bourgeois philosophy there exist many theories which thought modified date back to the old, well criticised concept of thinking, e.g. neopositivism, which tries to reduce consciousness to a system of signs, to agreement of people as regards the meaning of laws; theories that try to separate consciousness, reason from belief like it is done in neo-Thomism. personalism takes consciousness as a concentration of the highest spiritual values of an individuum, as a spiritual primary element of existence.

Bourgeois philosophers' theories of consciousness show a deep crisis in bourgeois thinking, their inability to give constructive decisions to the basic philosophical problems. Compared to decadence and stagnation in bourgeois philosophy explaining the problems of consciousness, dialectical materialism is characterised by a profound scientific approach and comprehensive substantiation of dialectical materialist explanation of the essence of consciousness' specific ideal nature, sources and laws of its development, purpose and meaning in social life, and ties with matter.

Chapter II

THE LAWS OF MATERIALIST DIALECTICS

Dialectical materialism is materialist dialectics viewed as a system of its laws.

Materialist dialectics regarded in modern terms is a philosophical theory of universal connections, motion and development of reality -- nature, society and knowledge. What makes this theory scientific is the laws that govern the world. In this chapter we shall consider these laws.

1. Historical Forms and Levels of Development of Dialectics

In his works Anti-Dühring, Dialectics of Nature, Ludwig Feuerbach and the End of Classical German Philosophy Engels wrote that in its historical development dialectics had assumed such basic forms as the spontaneous dialectics of ancient Greeks, the idealist dialectics of classical German philosophy and materialist dialectics. He considered Aristotle and Hegel to be the most outstanding representatives of dialectics of the past, although both of them were idealists. The intermediate form of dialectics was the dialectics of the Russian revolutionary democrats A.I. Herzen, V.G. Belinsky, N.G. Chernyshevsky and N.A. Dobrolyubov, who had come squarely to dialectical materialism (to use Lenin's expression about Herzen) and thereby created the highest form of pre-Marxian dialectics.

In 17th and 18th-century philosophy when metaphysics was dominant, dialectics, as Engels put it, "had brilliant exponents (e.g. Descartes and Spinoza)".¹ Engels also referred to Diderot and Rousseau, who had left the high examples of dialectics especially when they transcended philosophy proper.

The characteristic feature of historical development of dialectics is that it has never assumed a "pure form", that it has always been associated either with the idealist or mate-

1. F. Engels, Anti-Dühring, pp. 28-30

rialist theory of knowledge. The connection with either theory of knowledge is the decisive factor which determines the historical form of dialectics at any level of its development.

This is a historically given concrete system of dialectics based on the corresponding theory of knowledge (metaphysical, idealist or dualist). As it was stated, the history of philosophy knows three basic historical forms of dialectics: the spontaneous dialectics of ancient Greeks, the dialectics of German classical philosophy at the turn of the 19th century, and, lastly, the scientific materialist dialectics of Marxism.

Alongside the historical forms of dialectics there are different levels of its own historical development. The historical level of dialectics is determined by the degree of its penetration into the essence of the real world:

Naturally, dialectics exists in historically different forms. The dialectics of materialist Heraclitus differs from the dialectics of idealist Aristotle, while the dialectics of ancient Greeks differs, by and large, from the dialectics of Hegel; the latter, in its turn, is fundamentally different from Marxist dialectics. But all truly dialectical teachings represent different stages of the historical development of dialectics, out of which we can single out three basic levels: 1) dialectics of relations and connections; 2) dialectics of motion; 3) dialectics of development. The first level was expressed in classical form in ancient Greek philosophy; the second was reached in the 17th and 18th centuries; and the third dates back to the 19th and 20th centuries.

Let us now consider the main historical levels and forms of development of dialectics.

Dialectics of Relations and
Connections in Ancient
Greek Philosophy

Any dialectics begins with
the understanding of the in-
ternal unity of opposites.
Lenin wrote: "In brief dialec-
tics can be defined as the
doctrine of the unity of opposites."¹ Another definition of
dialectics as such, given by Lenin, contains the same idea:
"Dialectics is the teaching which shows how opposites can be

¹. V.I. Lenin, Collected Works, Vol. 38, p. 222.

and how they happen to be (how they become) identical...".¹ This kind of the understanding of dialectics makes it possible to comprehend the dialectics of ancient Greek philosophers who did not as yet know the concept "development" and nevertheless were dialecticians. Of course, it is wrong to say that ancient philosophers did not recognise motion and development, evolution. No doubt, they had generalised conceptions about motion and development (evolution). But a deep theoretical understanding of the essence of development and even motion as such was arrived at, when both concepts became the object of scientific study, i.e., at a much later time. In the ancient times, of all the sciences only geometry and arithmetic of the constants reached a relatively high level, and this fact influenced the mode of thinking among ancient philosophers who viewed every change as an inter-relationship between absolute, immutable essences.

For instance, Aristotle, regarding form and matter in statics, as absolute, eternal, immutable essences, at the same time constructed with the aid of these opposites the multi-form world of mutable things perceived by man's senses. Form and matter are not given separately in the sensuous world, and for this reason he transferred them to the other world of pretersensual being.

The ancient Greek materialists saw the realisation of dialectics only in the sensuous world. Democritus explained the multiplicity of things by a combination of atoms, the latter, not the world man observes, being eternal, immutable and absolutely simple. We find the unity and conflict of opposites in the dialectics of Heraclitus, but they figure only in the sensuous world, not in the world of the Logos, an eternal, immutable extra-world law.

The essence of the dialectics of relations and connections lies in the fact that all sensuously perceived phenomena, objects and processes are regarded as the unity (relation, connection) of absolute essences, elements. Ancient Greeks

1. V.I. Lenin, Collected Works, Vol. 38, p. 109.

understood their inner unity, correlation, connection of such opposites as a single thing and many things, the universal and the individual, the simple and the complex, the whole and the part, form and matter, etc.

The spontaneous nature of the dialectics of ancient Greeks consisted in that their dialectical conceptions were the result not of the generalisation of scientific data, but of the perception of processes which were observed directly — rotation in nature, transmutations of things into one another (fluids into gas during evaporation, burning objects into fire, ashes, etc.). But the Greeks supplemented, in a speculative way, this picture of ongoing processes with the absolutely immutable, independent, eternal essences, elements. As Aristotle wrote: "In fact, how will the order of things look like unless there is something eternal, separately existing and immutable."¹

Dialectics of Motion -- the second necessary stage in its historical development -- began to form in the 16th century and existed up to the end of the 18th century. In that period motion was in the focus of philosophers' attention. This turn in philosophical thought was conditioned by the state of scientific knowledge.

The study of the mechanical form of motion in natural science brought about an integral picture of the world and led to the appearance of mechanism as a style of thinking typical of the epoch. Mechanism that absolutised the simplest forms of motion of matter -- mechanical motion -- went hand in hand with a profound dialectical understanding of the orbital movement of planets as the unity of attraction and repulsion, action and counter-action, centripetal and centrifugal forces, etc.

The dialectics of motion is specific, because it recognises the absolute nature of motion and the relative nature of rest. All the parameters of connections and the relations

^{1.} Aristotle, Works in 4 volumes, Vol. I, Moscow, 1976, p. 275 (in Russian).

of things are regarded by it as mutable, unstable, fluid, in a word, not absolute. This dialectics reveals the stable, immutable connections and relations in the process of change.¹ A great deal of formulas appear to fix the stable relations and connections of unstable, fluid variables and parameters.

This specific feature of natural science could not but influence philosophy, which since then associated the essence with motion, not with the absolute, immutable elements of the world.

Francis Bacon rejected the absolute and eternal essences advanced by Aristotle, even the atoms and the vacuum proposed by Leucippus and Democritus and contrasted them with "fluid matter". The state of rest is only seeming, only motion is true, he wrote, because there is no true rest in bodies that are familiar to us, not in whole bodies, not in their parts, but we see only the seeming rest, caused either by equilibrium or by absolute preponderance of motion.²

According to Descartes, motion is also absolute and undestructible. The quantity of motion in matter is constant only because "God is immutable and always performs one and the same action by acting in the same way. For if we assume that since the creation God put a definite quantity of motion in whole matter, it must be recognized that He

1. The prominent physicist V. Heisenberg writes: "The Greeks did not hold the idea that it is possible to single out experimentally natural processes in order to study them in detail and also to reveal immutable laws, contained in constant change.... During its inception in the 16th-18th centuries natural science made the problem of motion a central problem and, consequently, introduced the concept of time to its foundation. Since Newton's time physics invariably studied dynamic laws, not configurations or geometrical forms. This equation of motion relates to any moment of time and in this sense it is eternal, whereas geometrical forms, e.g. planetary orbits, undergo change". See V. Heisenberg, Physics and Philosophy, Moscow, 1963, p. 49 (in Russian).

2. See F. Bacon, Works, Vol. 2, p. 205 (in Russian).

preserves it in the same amount..."¹ The dualist Descartes still needed the idea of God in order to explain the origin of motion itself, which, however, underlies the explanation of all phenomena in the material world.

However, Spinoza discards the problem of connecting matter with motion by advancing the tenet on the eternal nature of material substance to which motion is proper since the very beginning. In the opinion of Spinoza, the "power of God is nothing but its effective essence and therefore it is equally impossible for us to imagine that God either does not act or does not exist."² In the philosophy of Spinoza, God and material substance are synonyms. He wrote: "... Still I do not know why matter is unworthy of divine nature... . Outside God there cannot be any substance whose action nature could experience I repeat, everything exists in God, and everything that takes place proceeds only according to the laws of God's infinite nature and follows ... from the need for its essence"³ All changes in things that occur in world are thus subject to the immutable laws of God's essence, which is nothing else but material substance.

And while Spinoza did not advance a formulation that motion is an attribute of matter, i.e. the mode of its existence, J. Tolandt, 18th-century English materialist, and J. La Mettrie, D. Diderot and P. Holbach, French materialists, formulated this proposition in precise terms: "... motion is the mode of existence ... that follows of necessity from the essence of matter."⁴

This tenet became a very important principle of the dialectical conception of materialism.

Thus, there was no interval in the history of development of dialectics, and live dialectical thought pulsated in 17th and 18th century philosophy, being a step forward compared to

1. R. Descartes, Selected Works, p. 201 (in Russian)

2. B. Spinoza, Selected Works, Vol. 1. Moscow, 1957, p. 405, (in Russian).

3. Ibid., pp. 376-377.

4. P. Holbach, The System of Nature, Moscow, 1940, p. 18 (in Russian).

the dialectics of ancient people.

Dialectics of Development

Before the end of the 18th century the conception of development could not come into being or formed for the

simple reason that the world's only sphere where development could be observed in a "direct" form — the history of society — did not succeed in properly "unfolding" at that time. Of course, people had already worked out the concept of history as a chronological succession of events. But several epochs or several socio-economic formations had to replace one another and some time had to elapse since the Renaissance before it became clear that the historical process was irreversible and that historical development proceeded along an ascending line.

In the 19th century the conception of development did not make its appearance at once, in a ready-made form. It originated in the latter half of the 18th century when in addition to the mechanical motion of matter people discovered (still in embryo) the specific laws of thermal, chemical, geological, biological and other, more complex than mechanical, forms of motion of matter. These laws made scholars think over the correlation of different levels of matter's organization and the origin of these differences.

Ideas of development sprang in different sciences (Lomonosov, Rousseau, Herder, Kant, Ber, Lamarck and others). However, these ideas assumed a compromise form of evolutionism, which, on the one hand, was an antipode to the "eternal cycle" of primary conceptions of motion, and, on the other, could not evolve into a consistent conception of development, since the ascending movement continued to obey the same eternal, immutable laws. Therefore, sooner or later evolutionism had to come into conflict with the conception of development that appeared in the 1830s and could impart a new integral form to dialectics.

The dialectical conception of development is the complete reverse of flat evolutionism as a metaphysical conception of development. While putting them in a juxtaposition, Lenin wrote: "The two basic (or two possible? or two historically observable?) conceptions of development (evolution)

are: development as decrease and increase, as repetition, and development as a unity of opposites (the division of a unity into mutually exclusive opposites and their reciprocal relation).¹ Only the dialectics of development unfetters motion from eternal and absolute relations and connections, establishes a definite logical correlation between different forms of motion of matter between the superior, more complex and the lowest. Only the dialectics of development reveals the transition from one form of motion of matter to another, only it establishes a genuine system of laws of dialectical development.

The dialectics of development, on an idealist basis, emerged in the classical German philosophy of the late 18th and early 19th century. We can observe the embryo of the dialectics of development in the philosophical system of Kant.² In natural science he proposed a hypothesis concerning the historical origin of the solar system from the gaseous "nebula". Kantian philosophy still contained elements of evolutionism, since nature, according to him, undergoes evolutionary development under the immutable, inviolable sway of pre-set principles of reason that prescribes to nature the laws of its motion, Kantian philosophy was marked by a characteristic contradiction - that between the idea of development of nature and the admission of "immutable laws of nature as maxims of the speculative application of reason."²

J. G. Fichte made another step forward in elaborating the dialectics of development. He focussed his attention on the history of the spiritual activity of man, the subject of history. Though in a mystic form, Fichte formulated the idea of laws, the "inevitable" replacement of the stages of man's development through which anybody cannot skip over, but will naturally pass through them, quickly or slowly.

A new formulation of the question of the laws of motion taken in the form of development lies in the fact that change takes into its orbit the very whole. Whereas the 18th century system of nature admitted changes only in respect of parts

1. V. I. Lenin, Collected Works, Vol. 38, p. 358.

2. I. Kant, Works, Vol. 3, p. 438 (in Russian).

with the immutability of the "great whole" (nature), the dialectical conception of development takes up not the correlation between fluid parts and the stationary whole, but changes in the very whole which influence its parts and determine changes in them, in other words, it extends the principle of absolute motion to the very whole.

The subjectivist-idealistic basis of Fichte's teaching of necessity makes development with its system of stages and laws take place in the world of spirit where time is of no significance. The concept of development existing still in its simple form in Fichte's system was bound to transcend the close framework of subjective idealism and receive a wider scope for its application.

F.W.J. Schelling and G.W.F. Hegel took out the concept of development beyond the bounds of individual human mind and elaborated it relying on the material of the historical development of sciences (nature, society and knowledge). The Hegelian conception of development became the greatest dialectical conception elaborated within the framework of classical German philosophy.

The Hegelian philosophical system (like classical German philosophy in general) declares the spiritual, ideal to be an active side, which exists objectively, that is outside the human mind. Fichte's idea of the subject is also preserved in Hegelian philosophy. Hegel holds that the subject of development is not man's self-consciousness but an Absolute Idea as logic, i.e. the dialectical movement of "pure concepts". Hegelian logic presented in his Science of Logic is a relatively coherent system of the categories of dialectics, where the excessive abstract consideration is compensated by a deep and detailed description of mutual transitions of categories. This system of categories reproduces, in fact, the logical course of the historical development of philosophy, human thinking, although Hegel regarded it as something pre-natural and pre-human.

Having exhausted the logical consideration of the development of the categories of dialectics, Hegel made his Absolute Idea cognise itself in the sphere of phenomena of nature into which it is transformed and embodied, regarding

it as a form of his other being. At its second stage the development of the Absolute Idea takes place regardless of time, but this does not mean that development does not proceed. We see the transition from simple laws of mechanics to more complicated laws of nature, up to and including the laws of biology. Hegelian philosophy of nature contains a multitude of interesting aspects, one of which is the formulation of the question about the correlation between the laws of dialectics and those of nature (natural science). Characteristically, it is partial motion, not historical development, i.e. the development of the whole in the sphere of nature. In point of fact, the whole is invariable. Nature, in including the animal world,¹ is dominated by dialectics which was characteristic of 17th- and 18th-century philosophy, i.e. the dialectics of motion. If development is allowed in nature, it takes place in the sphere of the spiritual (Absolute Idea), which binds different spheres of nature into a definite sequence that leads to the becoming of the whole.

Only at the third, highest, stage of development of the Absolute Idea, described by Hegel in his Philosophy of Spirit, genuine history comes into full play, i.e. development assumes a historical form and takes place in time. Consecutively passing through the numerous stages of socio-historical development, the Absolute Idea that takes on the form of spirit is consummated in "absolute knowledge", in philosophical science, i.e. in Logic described by Hegel at the outset. The large circle of the Absolute Idea's movement is thus closed. The same movement may start anew, but this will be ascending movement, development of which, however, is restricted by a point of departure that with perfidy awaits us at the end of the system. The Hegelian philosophical system, like all the preceding philosophical systems, made a claim to completely consummated, exhaustive knowledge, to absolute truth. It differed from

1. "But organic nature has no history of its own: from its universal -- from life -- it directly descends into the singularity of existence, and the moments of simple definiteness and singular vitality united in this reality give rise to the formation only as fortuitous motion in which each of them is active in its own way and the whole is preserved...". (G.W.F. Hegel, Works, Vol. IV, p. 159. In Russian).

with the immutability of the "great whole" (nature), the dialectical conception of development takes up not the correlation between fluid parts and the stationary whole, but changes in the very whole which influence its parts and determine changes in them, in other words, it extends the principle of absolute motion to the very whole.

The subjectivist-idealistic basis of Fichte's teaching of necessity makes development with its system of stages and laws take place in the world of spirit where time is of no significance. The concept of development existing still in its simple form in Fichte's system was bound to transcend the close framework of subjective idealism and receive a wider scope for its application.

F.W.J. Schelling and G.W.F. Hegel took out the concept of development beyond the bounds of individual human mind and elaborated it relying on the material of the historical development of sciences (nature, society and knowledge). The Hegelian conception of development became the greatest dialectical conception elaborated within the framework of classical German philosophy.

The Hegelian philosophical system (like classical German philosophy in general) declares the spiritual, ideal to be an active side, which exists objectively, that is outside the human mind. Fichte's idea of the subject is also preserved in Hegelian philosophy. Hegel holds that the subject of development is not man's self-consciousness but an Absolute Idea as logic, i.e. the dialectical movement of "pure concepts". Hegelian logic presented in his Science of Logic is a relatively coherent system of the categories of dialectics, where the excessive abstract consideration is compensated by a deep and detailed description of mutual transitions of categories. This system of categories reproduces, in fact, the logical course of the historical development of philosophy, human thinking, although Hegel regarded it as something pre-natural and pre-human.

Having exhausted the logical consideration of the development of the categories of dialectics, Hegel made his Absolute Idea cognise itself in the sphere of phenomena of nature into which it is transformed and embodied, regarding

lism. It includes the latter only in a substantially modified, revised form (as a "rational kernel"). Being an integral system, scientific dialectics is the direct opposite of Hegelian dialectics. In 1873, Marx wrote: "My dialectical method is not only different from the Hegelian, but is its direct opposite. To Hegel, the life-process of the human brain, i.e., the process of thinking, which, under the name of 'the Idea', he even transforms into an independent subject, is the demiurgo^s of the real world, and the real world is only the external, phenomenal form of 'the Idea'. With me, on the contrary, the ideal is nothing else than the material world reflected by the human mind, and translated into forms of thought."¹

The first pivotal feature of Hegelian idealism (and mysticism) is the reduction of all the wealth and variety of nature and social history to the logic, self-development of the concept. Its second pivotal feature, closely associated with the first feature, is the distortion of the concept of subject. The subject is not real man, a member of society, but a mystical extrahuman spirit. Man himself turns into a passive executor of the aims of the Absolute Idea. The constant "inflation" (to use Lenin's word), absolutisation of the general properties of things, the elevation of the properties above the very things, including the elevation of the activity of human mind into the rank of some independent universal essence, which is the absolute subject and at the same time the object of self-cognition, is a specific feature of Hegelian idealism.

The "secret" of Hegelian idealism was divulged by Marx and Engels in their works of 1844-1846. They showed that the real subject of actual history is man who transforms the surrounding world, the historical conditions of his activity, while the idea is only a product of his creative activity, in this case spiritual activity, which is only the subjective expression of the material and practical, social and historical activity.

¹. Karl Marx, Capital, Vol. I, p. 29.

other systems in that the credit of discovering absolute truth was ascribed not to its author alone but to the entire collective of philosophers who throughout the history of philosophy consistently prepared the comprehensive system of Hegel by elaborating category after category. But having turned the history of philosophy into a history of preparing his philosophical system as a consummation of this history, Hegel betrayed the principles of development he had himself discovered.

Thus, the Hegelian philosophical system does not consequentially carry over the principles of development through the system of philosophical categories due to two circumstances: (1) the wrong understanding of the correlation between the laws of dialectics and the development of scientific knowledge (the problem raised in the Philosophy of Nature and the Philosophy of Spirit); and (2) the initial idealist point of view and the construction of the system of dialectical categories. Engels wrote that the main contradiction of Hegelian philosophy was that the whole dogmatic content of the Hegelian system contradicted "his dialectical method, which dissolves all dogmatism".¹

Hegelian philosophy reflected that period in the development of natural science, which may be described as a period of theoretical science in the making. The very fact that Hegel created his dialectics before the great general discoveries had been made in natural science (the discovery of the cell, the law of conservation and transformation of energy, Darwin's discoveries in biology and those of Mendeleyev in chemistry) testifies to his genius. At the same time, the Hegelian conception of development is in essence the dialectical conception of the formation of concrete wholeness, not its development, that is, it is an incomplete conception of development. It extends only to the past, but not to the present and future. The dialectics of formation is only a moment of the dialectics of development. For this reason Marxist dialectics is not simply Hegelian dialectics purified of idea-

1. K. Marx, P. Engels, Selected Works in three volumes, Vol. 3, p. 340.

time science rose up to the level of studying the processes of change and the development of natural and historical phenomena the laws of dialectics emerged as such universal laws, proving the inadequacy of the laws of formal logic that reigned supreme in the former science. "But it is precisely dialectics," Engels emphasised, "that constitutes the most important form of thinking for present-day natural science, for it alone offers the analogue for, and thereby the method of explaining, the evolutionary processes occurring in nature, inter-connections in general, and transitions from one field of investigations to another."¹

The dialectical method of Marxism is scientific precisely because it made as its subject-matter, above all, the laws governing the objective reality. These laws of dialectics were the outcome of the philosophical generalisation of the results achieved in the development of sciences at their theoretical stage. "for a stage in the outlook on nature," Engels wrote, "where all differences become merged in intermediate steps, and all opposites pass into one another through intermediate links, the old metaphysical method of thought no longer suffices. Dialectics, which likewise knows no hard and fast lines, no unconditional, universally valid 'either-or' and which bridges the fixed metaphysical differences, and besides 'either-or' recognises also in the right place 'both this -- and that' and reconciles the opposites, is the sole method of thought appropriate in the highest degree to this stage."²

Dialectics had the same methodological importance to the social sciences whose theoretical development began in the 19th century. A decisive contribution to the progress of the social sciences in the 19th century was made by Marx and Engels, the founders of scientific, i.e. materialist dialectics. This is what Lenin aptly said while describing the Marx-Engels correspondence: "If one were to attempt to define in a single word the focus, so to speak, of the whole corres-

1. F. Engels, Anti-Dühring, p. 43.

2. Ibid., pp. 212-213.

2. Materialist Dialectics as a Scientific Method of Thought, Cognition and Revolutionary Practice

Dialectics¹ as a Method
of Cognition and Practical
Activity

The method is a form of movement of thoughts or practical actions. It implies certain general principles and the

continuity of brain and practical actions. Being general points of departure in the teaching about methods, these principles are the result of generalising the laws of objective reality, that is, they are not thought up but are taken from the external material world. While criticising Duhring for his distorted view of the origin of the principles of thought, Engels wrote: "... The principles are not the starting-point of the investigation, but its final result; they are not applied to nature and human history, but abstracted from them; it is not nature and the realm of humanity which conform to these principles, but the principles are only valid in so far as they are in conformity with nature and history."²

Materialist dialectics as a scientific method of knowledge is a teaching about the more general laws of the development of nature, society and cognition. This means that its laws must be valid both for motion in nature and human history and for motion in thought. "Such a law," Engels added, can be recognised in two of these three spheres, indeed even in all three, without the metaphysical philistine being clearly aware that it is one and the same law that he has come to know.³.

The methodological value of dialectics, thus, lies in the fact that it is a teaching about one and the same laws, no matter what sphere of the world is taken up. Since the

1. In Ancient Greece the term "dialectics" meant the ability to hold a conversation or argument, in which opposite views collided and truth was the result of resolving contradictions.

2. F. Engels, Anti-Dühring, p. 48.

3. Ibid., p. 267.

Principles of Universal
Interconnection and De-
velopment

In his article "Three Sources
and Three Component Parts of
Marxism" Lenin defined dia-
lectics as the "doctrine of

development in its fullest, deepest and most comprehensive
form, the doctrine of the relativity of the human knowledge
that provides us with a reflection of eternally developing
matter."¹

The dialectics of development, as was noted above, is
the supreme stage in the historical evolution of dialectics.
However, in accordance with the principle of development the
very dialectics of development also presupposes (includes in
its structure) the principle of universal interconnection
as a more general principle. In his Dialectics of Nature
Engels highlighted the need for developing the "general nature
of dialectics" as "the science of interconnections, in
contrast to metaphysics."² In some other place he described
it in the following terms: "Dialectics as the science of
universal interconnections."³ Thus, the understanding of
dialectics as the science of universal interconnection is a
starting point for modern, Marxist dialectics.

What, then, is the interconnection? It is a definite
type of relations. If the relation is the existence of two
or more objects, phenomena, properties, concepts, conceptions
comparable with one another, the connection is the relation
between two or more objects, phenomena, properties, concepts
and conceptions, in which a change in one involves a change
in another. Things and ideas completely disconnected with
one another may be placed in some relation: for example, a
stone which turns up in one town may be heavier than another
stone formed in another town, but the antagonistic classes
of the bourgeois society are closely interconnected.

1. V.I. Lenin, Collected Works, Vol. 19, p. 24

2. F. Engels, Dialectics of Nature, p. 62.

3. Ibid., p. 17.

pondence, the central point at which the whole body of ideas expressed and discussed converges - that word would be dialectics. The application of materialist dialectics to the reshaping of all political economy from its foundations up, its application to history, natural science, philosophy and to the policy and tactics of the working class -- that was what interested Marx and Engels most of all, that was where they contributed what was most essential and new, and that was what constituted the masterly advance they made in the history of revolutionary thought.¹

The classics of Marxism-Leninism laid the theoretical basis for a whole series of the social sciences: the theory of state and law, concrete social investigations (microsociology), civil history, the theory of art. They elaborated the general principle of linguistics, psychology, anthropology and other sciences. As for scientific political economy, philosophy and the theory of scientific communism, their creation and theoretical substantiation brought Marx, Engels and Lenin great fame and credit.

The history of the social sciences during the last fifteen decades has cogently confirmed the efficiency of materialist dialectics as a scientific method. Wherever materialist dialectics was applied the social sciences scored great success. In socialist countries, materialist dialectics is widely used by the social sciences the state employs in social management. Long before the socialism triumphed in the Soviet Union materialist dialectics served the Leninist Communist Party an effective method of directing the working people's revolutionary struggle.

Materialist dialectics is a powerful methodological weapon wielded by the international communist movement to explain and transform the modern capitalist society along revolutionary lines.

1. V.I. Lenin, Collected Works, Vol. 19, p. 554.

Thus, the simplest social relation of man to nature is mediated by primitive implements of labour. If the latter are removed, man's relation to nature will be immediate as compared with any social relation. Accordingly, we shall find ourselves in the sphere of biological connections between the organism and the natural environment, where the role of mediated links will be played not by social phenomena, but by the natural ones (the animal's psychic activity, adaptation, etc.).

All the deep-going, latent necessary connections are of a mediate nature. On the surface of the world man perceives immediate connections and relations, while science uncovers the mediate nature of the connection between phenomena which outwardly do not appear to be interconnected.

In the world at large, every thing and every phenomenon are connected with all the rest through numerous intermediate links. Therefore, the world represents a single whole, in which every phenomenon occupies a definite place in the system of connections of all with all.

In addition to specific ties and laws of the world which are studied by particular sciences there are multiform connections between things and phenomena which are of a universal character and operate in any field of reality. These universal necessary connections are specially studied by materialist dialectics. They include those between cause and effect, essence and appearance, possibility and reality, quality and quantity, preceding negation and subsequent negation, form and content, etc., in a word, between the opposites.

All these types of the universal connection between phenomena make it possible to understand the world as something integral, that is, in a state of constant self-motion and development. For instance, the simplest, i.e. mechanical movement is the ratio of space and time. The velocity of a body's movement V is expressed by the formula $V = \frac{s}{t}$, or by a functional connection $s=f(t)$, where s is distance (space) and t - time.

The principle of development is expressed in the system of interconnections which are formed by the basic laws of

The antipode of interconnection is isolation, i.e. the type of relation in which a third member is included between two members of it to make impossible the interconnection between them. Isolation has no independent significance. It presupposes the existence of interconnection between phenomena. Isolation means the absence of interconnection in one aspect but the presence of it in the other aspect.

As regards their general structure, the connections are divided into immediate and mediate. The more immediate the connections, the more they are simple. And vice versa, the more complex the interconnection, the more it has mediacies, the more complex is their cognition.

While making an abstract of Hegel's Science of Logic, Lenin emphasized his words: "There is nothing (Hegel's italics) in Heaven, Nature, Spirit, or anywhere else, which does not contain immediacy as well as mediacy...".¹. Further Lenin wrote:

- 1) "Heaven-Nature-Spirit. Heaven away: materialism.
- 2) Everything is vermittelt -- mediated, bound into one, connected by transitions. Away with Heaven -- law-governed connection of the whole (process) of the world."²

Thus, Lenin discarded Hegelian idealism and highlights the mediated nature of connections of everything with everything.

Absolutely immediate relations and connections do not exist. Every immediacy of relations and connections is only possible in correlation with more complex or mediate connections. This means that immediate connections can be singled out by making an analysis of the mediate connections, as more simple connections for a given object.

Science begins to study immediate connections empirically, since it establishes the lowest boundary beyond which there is no objective area of study.

1. V.I. Lenin, Collected Works, Vol. 38, p. 103.

2. Ibid.

under which (1) internal contradictions of a changing object are the source of these changes; (2) the changes themselves bear not only a quantitative gradual character, but also a qualitative, spasmodic character; and (3) every new, more higher stage or level of changes includes the positive content of the preceding stages or levels of changes, thanks to which it is possible to draw a distinction between the higher and more progressive state (stage) and the less developed, surmounted state or level of the object.

As we see, materialist dialectics organically combines the principle of universal connection and the principle of development, revealing in a comprehensive way the very development through the system of universal laws, the necessary internal ties.

The basic laws of dialectics operate as the determining universal connections, since thanks to them the entire system of dialectical ties uncovers itself as a comprehensive revelation of the principle of development and they also define the structure of the other laws of dialectics.

3. Basic Laws of Dialectics

The Law of Transformation of Quantitative into Qualitative Changes and Vice Versa

Development is a definite method of onward motion of things and phenomena, in which there are both quantitative and qualitative changes,

this process being irreversible. Of course, this is not a definition of the process of development, yet every development is bound to include both quantitative and qualitative changes.

What, then is quality? The first thing that strikes our eye in the surrounding world is the multiform differences between phenomena, conditioned by their qualitative features. There are two types of qualities. The first is an internal definiteness of an object which finds expression in a totality of essential properties that distinguish this object from others. The quality of the first type is the internal definiteness of an object in its external expression through some

dialectics: the law of transformation of quantitative into qualitative changes, the law of the unity and conflict of opposites, and the law of the negation of negation. The first law reveals the necessary connection between the quantitative and qualitative characteristics, properties of objects, between the qualitatively higher and more complex level of the object's organisation and its qualitatively less complex level, between the negative and positive opposites in the structure of the object (which form in unity the source and mechanism of the object's development), between the preceding negation and the subsequent, second negation that establishes a definite connection between the object's levels of development. As a result, the very principle of development represents a system of the universal connections which are concretised further through the non-basic laws of dialectics (the laws of the unity of form and content, essence and appearance, reality and possibility, etc.).

Thanks to this system of the basic and non-basic laws of dialectics the principle of development is revealed by Marxism in a comprehensive, i.e. dialectical way. As we have seen, Lenin's indication that modern dialectics is comprehensive is an important aspect of his definition of this dialectics. In our time, Lenin pointed out, "everybody is in agreement" with the principle of development. And in fact, it is difficult today to find even bourgeois ideologists, save, of course, the fascist ones, who would not talk about the need for man's further development towards "post-industrial society", a "technotronic era" and even a "truly open society", void of survivals of a "closed society". But at the close scrutiny all these conceptions have no bearing at all on a scientific understanding of development. They revert us to the 18th-century one-sided evolutionist conceptions of development that absolutised the vigorous quantitative changes in the object's properties in terms of their multiplication and growth. Their only modern aspect is not philosophical arguments, but empirical material - facts of scientific, technological and economic progress.

The dialectical conception of development is based on the understanding of the ascending, onward process of changes,

revealing that this dependence has a status of a universal law. There are no such objects and phenomena which would not obey this law.

It is important to take into account the fact that extensive quantitative changes bring about qualitative changes of the first type, while intensive quantitative changes bring about qualitative changes of the second type, i.e. fundamental qualitative changes.

For example, the transformation of capitalism into a world social system was the result of the extensive growth of capitalism only, whereas its fundamental change and transformation into socialism was the result of intensive quantitative changes, under way in each individual country (the growing productive forces, the mounting class struggle, etc.); the transformation of developed capitalism into monopoly capitalism meant a qualitative change, this process expressing "the transformation of quantity into quality, of developed capitalism into imperialism."¹ However this transformation does not mean a fundamental qualitative change, since it involved no change in the entire internal structure of capitalism, but a change in certain (albeit basic) characteristics. That is why Lenin stressed that imperialism is the stage of capitalism "... when certain of its fundamental characteristics began to change into their opposites, when the features of the epoch of transition from capitalism to a higher social and economic system had taken shape and revealed themselves in all spheres. Economically, the main thing in this process is the displacement of capitalist free competition by capitalist monopoly".² The transformation of capitalism into socialism is already the fundamental qualitative change that involves the restructuring of the entire socio-economic structure of society and its superstructure.

We must bear in mind that the emergence of a new quality leads, in turn, to new quantitative changes. For instance, the transition from hand-operated tools of labour to machine-

1. V.I. Lenin, Collected Works, Vol. 22, p. 267

2. Ibid., p. 265.

totality of properties. However, quality is not identical to property which is only one aspect of quality. For example, any body possesses a temperature. Moreover, qualitatively different bodies (say, animals and metals) may possess equal temperatures. Different political parties may have similar general characteristics (high discipline, etc.) but be opposed to each other. Thus, the property as distinct from quality represents a one-sided expression of quality. The second is the internal definiteness of an object that coincides with its specific structure. It can be called fundamental quality. The change in the main elements of the object's structure is a fundamental qualitative change.

Quality is the main characteristic of the definiteness of things and phenomena. But the very things and phenomena are not reducible to quality. Engels said that what exists is not qualities, but things possessing qualities. This means that in addition to differences between things and phenomena there is a common platform for the entire multiformity of phenomena in the world, represented by matter as the substance of all things. Qualities are simply different modifications of material substance, and are not aggregates of sensations only, as Machists maintained.

Quantity is the definiteness of things and phenomena which manifests itself in the change of their individual properties. Therefore, quantity is expressed either in the volume of a body or in the movement velocity, or in a body's temperature, or in light intensity, process intensity, etc. Quantity may be intensive or extensive. Intensive quantity represents changes per unit of a given quality, while extensive represents changes relating to the totality of units of a given quality.

At first glance, quality does not depend on quantity, since initially quantitative changes do not lead to changes in quality and take place within the framework of one and the same quality. But this independence of quality and quantity from each other has limitations beyond which we see the internal dependence of qualitative on quantitative changes. We may note that at a definite temperature water turns into vapour, metal is smelting, etc. Step by step human consciousness was

small leaps represent qualitative changes in separate aspects, elements of an object. The Great October Socialist Revolution in Russia was a great historic leap, which, however, was realised through a whole series of small leaps in the field of industry, agriculture, culture, etc.

Of great methodological importance for understanding social development are the concepts of "evolution" and "revolution". Evolution is a process of intensive quantitative changes which are accompanied by continuous qualitative changes only in separate aspects of an object, not in it as a whole.

Evolution is a unity of quantitative and qualitative changes. For instance, evolution in nature sees the replacement of some biological species by others, which qualitatively differ from one another. In society, evolution brings about not only quantitative, but also qualitative changes. For example, imperialism qualitatively differs from pre-monopoly capitalism and is a product of evolutionary, not of revolutionary changes in capitalism. However, this is not a fundamentally qualitative change in capitalism, but only a change in the sum total of its characteristics: free competition is replaced by fettered competition, etc.

Revolution is a fundamental qualitative change in social phenomena, that is a change in their inner structure. Revolutions (socio-political, economic, scientific, technological, scientific-and-technological, cultural, etc.) take place in a society and are being prepared by evolutionary changes, which, at the time of revolutionary changes, do not cease and continue to take place. Therefore, during revolutions reforms continue to retain their enormous significance for true revolutionaries. Disregard of reforms sooner or later brings about negative consequences and even leads to adventurism. Absolutisation of reforms, however, involves the rejection of revolutionary spirit altogether. An example of such absolutisation is the Social-Democratic conception of social development.

The unity of qualitative and quantitative changes is expressed in the category of measure. Measure is a qualitative quantity. It is a quantity behind which a qualitative change

ry brought about a sharp increase in production; qualitatively new relations of production were always accompanied by higher growth rates of the productive forces, etc.

The qualitative transformations fundamentally differ from the quantitative ones. The latter are continuous, which means that they involve the interchange of similar elements of objects, phenomena, processes, irrespective of the velocity and rate of this interchange. The former result in interruptions of gradual change, in other words, elements that make appearance are dissimilar with regard to those appeared so far. Thus, in the process of the transition from ape to man the erect posture became a new element (a new feature) of those biological changes that took place in the ape's brutal activity.

Thus, the qualitative transformation of objects and phenomena is of a leap-like nature. A leap is the interruption of gradualness, in the course of which elements of one quality are being replaced by elements of another quality. A social revolution is a case in point showing the leap-like conversion of one social system into another.

Leaps vary, but they are divided into two types: single (one-stage) and multistage. In those cases where the elements of the old quality are more or less simultaneously being replaced by the elements of a new quality a single leap takes place. Cases in point are the explosion resulting in the conversion of one chemical substance into another or the political revolution that is accompanied by the transfer of entire political power into the hands of other social forces. When the elements of one quality are being replaced by the elements of another quality in a certain sequence, the leap is multistage. For instance, the transition of ape to man is the history of the successive replacements of definite biological features by social ones. Moreover, the replacement of one feature by a new one cannot take place until the time such a replacement affects the other one that conditions the given feature. For instance, the ape cannot develop its forepaw into a hand until it acquires an erect gait.

Leaps can be big and small. A big leap envelops a fundamental qualitative change in an object as a whole, whereas

the statement that "fascism exists and at the same time does not exist in Chile", using the word "exist" in one and the same sense, i.e. in the sense of real existence.

As for dialectics, it considers concrete opposites. The latter represent the relation between mutual presence and absence of any property, characteristic, phenomenon, such as, for example, slave and slave-owner, serf and feudal lord, wage worker and capitalist. All these opposites represent the presence of labour in case of a toiler and the absence of labour in case of an exploiter, and, on the other hand, the presence of a definite form of private ownership in the case of an exploiter and its absence in the case of a toiler. Man and nature are also concrete opposites.

There is identity between concrete opposites which always directly precludes each other in one and the same respect. Identity is the relation of coincidence between properties, characteristics, features of an object. Man is not only anti-theoretical to nature, but is also identical to it. Thanks to identity (man is a natural being) the opposites may interact between themselves and hence may contradict each other dialectically. The dialectical contradiction is a concrete unity of the opposites, which is mediated by intermediate links. These opposites directly preclude each other at one and the same time and in one and the same respect, but are every time connected by concrete intermediate links. The dialectical contradiction differs from the formal logical one, first, by that it exists in objective reality and for this reason it must be with necessity reproduced in consciousness and, second, by that its structure includes concrete intermediate links. It is not enough to fix the opposites themselves, it is necessary to reveal their inner mediated connection between each other. Engels criticised the metaphysician E. Duhring, because he thought "in absolutely irreconcilable antitheses."¹

1. F. Engels, Anti-Dühring, p. 31.

of an object begins. For instance, the measure for water is the temperature 0° or 100°C, since water turns into ice, when its temperature falls below zero, or into vapour, when its temperature rises above 100°C. There is an approximate level of the development of society's productive forces, which is followed sooner or later by revolutionary changes in the mode of production. Any quantitative, including evolutionary, changes have the measure of these changes to be followed sooner or later by qualitative changes.

The Law of the Unity and
Struggle of Opposites

This law is, in Lenin's words, the nucleus of dialectics. It displays the inner source of development

of all the objects and phenomena of reality. Dialectical contradiction is the most general, abstract expression of the inner structure of all objects. It was already known to ancient philosophers, who fixed opposites in things and in their movement and even noted the struggle between the opposites (this can be most clearly seen in the case of Greek philosopher Heraclitus). But these philosophers failed to discover the law of the unity and conflict of opposites as a source of development. The very concept of development had come into use only by the mid-19th century -- in Hegelian and Marxist philosophy. But Hegel could not extend the concept of development to the material sphere of reality. This task was performed by the founders of Marxist philosophy.

As was said above, dialectics begins with the understanding of the unity of opposites. The opposites may be of two types: formal and concrete. The formal opposite is the relationship between the presence and absence of some property, characteristic, etc. Such relationship is always an aspect of the really existing relation between opposites. For instance, the statement "imperialism exists" is the opposite of the statement "imperialism does not exist". But in the second statement there is no positive content, there is only the absence of that which is asserted in the first sentence. This kind of opposites is considered in formal logic alone, which forbids at once to affirm and deny anything in one and the same sense and respect. For example, we cannot regard as true

in this society.

The development of a contradiction always goes through two stages: that of conformity and that of discrepancy. The quantitative discrepancy of opposites means that the contradiction concerned has reached the highest stage of development and needs a resolution, which leads to the emergence of a new contradiction (with qualitatively different opposites). By abolishing the class of capitalists the proletariat ceases to be the proletariat; it turns into a working class that wields the principal means of production. By eliminating the social opposites the working class becomes the master of public property and differs -- in a purely economic and not social way -- from the collective-farm peasantry, which is the owner of group property, hence not public one. The resolution of this contradiction will result in the abolition of all classes in society. The continuous quantitative polarisation will be responsible for continuous increase in public property and for the continuous decrease in the share of group property. The fundamental difference of the resolution of this contradiction from the resolution of that between antagonistic classes lies in that the former is not necessarily attended by a conflict, clash between the classes themselves.

The continuous process of the polarisation of opposites is the struggle between them, which always leads to a break in the "equal action" between them, to the appearance of a (quantitative) discrepancy. For this reason Lenin wrote: "The unity (coincidence, identity, equal action) of opposites is conditional, temporary, transitory, relative. The struggle of mutually exclusive opposites is absolute, just as development and motion are absolute Development is the 'struggle' of opposites."¹ The relativity of unity finds its expression in the fact that the "equal action" of opposites is always temporary, while the constant conflict of opposites always determines changes in the forms of their unity or alters them.

1. V.I. Lenin, Collected Works, Vol. 38, p. 358.

The mediated structure of dialectical contradictions must be reproduced by theoretical science, which is the case in fact, for it rejects the old metaphysical method of thought. As Engels wrote: "For a stage in the outlook on nature where all differences become merged in intermediate steps, and all opposites pass into one another through intermediate links, the old metaphysical method of thought no longer suffices. Dialectics, which likewise knows no hard and fast lines, no unconditional, universally valid 'either-or' and besides 'either-or' recognises also in the right place 'both this -- and that' and reconciles the opposites, is the sole method of thought appropriate in the highest degree to this stage."¹ In Capital Marx systematically applied the method of analysing intermediate links to resolving dialectical contradictions in political economy, which reflected the real contradictions of the economic life in bourgeois society.

The object's development is the development of its contradictions. And the development of the contradiction is the polarisation of opposites, which has two aspects: (a) increase in the system of intermediate links and (b) change in the quantitative relations between the opposites themselves. For instance, the development of capitalism's social structure since the 19th century was accompanied by the expansion of the middle strata of society, with the share of the traditional petty bourgeoisie perceptibly falling (especially so after new "middle strata" appeared on the scene). The quantitative correlation of the basic classes of capitalist society -- the capitalists and the workers -- changed substantially: on the average, the share of all capitalists shranked to roughly 3 per cent, whereas the share of the workers in the industrialised states rose up to 70-75 per cent. This obvious quantitative discrepancy of social groups in the capitalist society testifies now, to a greater extent than in the latter part of the 19th century, to the fact that the capitalist class is a redundant social group

1. F. Engels, Anti-Dühring, pp. 212-213.

progressive (negating) side of the contradiction may act as such only thanks to the conservative (accumulating, fixing) side of the contradiction. The abolition of the conservative side is at the same time the abolition of the progressive side of the given contradictory whole. By abolishing the bourgeoisie the proletariat abolishes itself as the proletariat, i.e. as a class deprived of any property.

There are contradictions of different types.

The internal contradictions are the contradictions of the very structure of the object. They are necessary, are inalienable from an object. Since all the objects in the world are interrelated, they are bound to exercise appropriate external influence on each other. Internal contradictions, without which the structure of a given whole is inconceivable, manifest themselves in the mutual relations of the given object with other objects. The external contradictions have no independent significance and are determined by internal contradictions. They are an expression of internal contradictions. Even the contradiction between two modern world systems - the socialist and capitalist ones - has no independent significance and is determined by the contradiction between labour and capital, intrinsic in the capitalist system. The socialist countries represent the "kingdom of labour", the world of victorious labour which is externally opposed to capital. The contradiction between two world social systems will be resolved only when the contradiction between labour and capital, inherent in capitalism, is resolved.

The contradiction between two extremes in the structure of an object is basic. Accordingly, the contradiction between any other elements, sides of the object are non-basic. For instance, the contradiction between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie in capitalist society is a basic social one, whereas the contradictions between any other classes are not such ones. The resolution of non-basic contradictions is of great significance for the resolution of the basic contradiction, but only the resolution of the basic contradiction leads to a final change in the object as a whole.

The main driving force of development is one of the sides aimed at the negation of the contradictory whole. It is always a negative side of the contradiction. The negative side of the contradiction is the opposite, aimed at changing the given contradictory whole, and not something ugly from the ethical point of view. It is the most mobile side of the contradiction, which has, so to say, a negative direction of its movement, as a result of which the very whole is subject to change. In The Holy Family, by citing the antagonism between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat, Marx and Engels showed the specimen of a concrete methodological analysis of different positions of each opposites in the structure of the contradiction. They wrote: "Proletariat and wealth are opposites; as such they form a single whole. They are both creations of the world of private property. The question is exactly what place each occupies in the antithesis. It is not sufficient to declare them two sides of a single whole.

"Private property as private property, as wealth, is compelled to maintain itself, and thereby its opposites, the proletariat, in existence. That is the positive side of the antithesis, self-satisfied private property.

"The proletariat, on the contrary, is compelled as proletariat to abolish itself and thereby its opposite, private property, which determines its existence, and which makes it proletariat. It is the negative side of the antithesis, its restlessness within its very self, dissolved and self-dissolving private property."¹

The proletariat is the main driving force of progress in bourgeois society. However, no matter how great is the role played by the main driving force of development, it, like any other motive force, only accelerates the process of development and assists it. The determining role in development always belongs to the inner contradiction of objects. The inner contradiction is the source of the development of every object or phenomenon. This means that the

^{1.} K. Marx, F. Engels, Collected Works, Vol. 4, pp. 35-36.

progressive (negating) side of the contradiction may act as such only thanks to the conservative (accumulating, fixing) side of the contradiction. The abolition of the conservative side is at the same time the abolition of the progressive side of the given contradictory whole. By abolishing the bourgeoisie the proletariat abolishes itself as the proletariat, i.e. as a class deprived of any property.

There are contradictions of different types.

The internal contradictions are the contradictions of the very structure of the object. They are necessary, are inalienable from an object. Since all the objects in the world are interrelated, they are bound to exercise appropriate external influence on each other. Internal contradictions, without which the structure of a given whole is inconceivable, manifest themselves in the mutual relations of the given object with other objects. The external contradictions have no independent significance and are determined by internal contradictions. They are an expression of internal contradictions. Even the contradiction between two modern world systems - the socialist and capitalist ones - has no independent significance and is determined by the contradiction between labour and capital, intrinsic in the capitalist system. The socialist countries represent the "kingdom of labour", the world of victorious labour which is externally opposed to capital. The contradiction between two world social systems will be resolved only when the contradiction between labour and capital, inherent in capitalism, is resolved.

The contradiction between two extremes in the structure of an object is basic. Accordingly, the contradiction between any other elements, sides of the object are non-basic. For instance, the contradiction between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie in capitalist society is a basic social one, whereas the contradictions between any other classes are not such ones. The resolution of non-basic contradictions is of great significance for the resolution of the basic contradiction, but only the resolution of the basic contradiction leads to a final change in the object as a whole.

Depending on the stage of change, the development of the object, basic and non-basic contradictions may play the role of a principal or non-principal contradiction. The principal contradiction is the one of whose resolution depends the further change of the object. For instance, it was impossible to start the building of socialism in Russia without establishing proletarian dictatorship. But even after the establishment of this dictatorship the contradiction between the most advanced type of state -- proletarian dictatorship -- and the backward economy came to the foreground. This contradiction was resolved by the policy of industrialisation, collectivisation, etc. until the time when in the 1930s socialism was built in the USSR.

Since the victory of the socialist revolution in Russia in October 1917 the contradiction between socialism and the present capitalism has become the basic contradiction of the present epoch. In the 1930s and the first half of the 1940s, the contradiction between fascism and the bloc of the socialist and all anti-fascist forces of the world (non-basic contradiction of our epoch) was the principal contradiction of our age. Fascism proved to be the main obstacle in the way of social progress throughout the world, and the further process of resolving the basic contradiction of the epoch depended on the destruction of international fascism, of its crack forces.

An efficient combination of struggle for final and immediate goals implies the understanding of the basic and principal contradictions in development.

Antagonistic contradictions are the contradictions in which one side exists and develops at the expense of the other. Non-antagonistic contradictions are those in which the development of one side presupposes the development of the other, antithetical one, and in its turn assists it. Private ownership of the means of production shapes antagonistic contradictions, whereas the dominant social one produces non-antagonistic contradictions. The exploiter classes that dominated history existed and developed at the expense of the labour of the exploited classes. But antagonisms always existed inside the exploiter classes, since the growth

of wealth in the form of private property, in addition to the labour of the exploited, may also take place at the expense of the redistribution of this property. The latter manifests itself most glaringly under capitalist competition.

Under socialism the antagonistic contradictions disappear, while the non-antagonistic ones are preserved, since no development in general is possible without contradictions. The identification and practical resolution of contradictions under socialism is a necessary element of scientific management of society. However, the absence of antagonistic contradictions under socialism does not mean that socialist society possesses no elements of antagonism in the initial period -- the contradictions between the dominant scientific ideology of society (Marxism), communist morality and various survivals of the past in people's consciousness and behaviour. Under socialism, these contradictions have no independent significance, for socialism can also exist without them. Therefore, they are not necessary and characteristic of socialism. They only represent the elements of antagonism, since the abolition of one aspect of the contradiction does not lead to the disappearance of another.

Socialist society, being the society of a new historical type which replaced the century-old domination of the exploiter societies, naturally possesses its own specific features, that are expressed in the operation of the laws of materialist dialectics. This concerns, above all, the question of the character and mechanism of surmounting contradictions under socialism.

The Law of the Negation of Negation

This law reveals the onward and cyclical character of development in the world.

Being the most complicated

law among the basic laws of dialectics, it includes as elements other basic laws of dialectics - qualitative-cum-quantitative ties, relations of opposites, and contradictions.

Dialectical negation is the main element of the given law. The concept of dialectical negation has the following features. First, negation is objective by its nature. This means that dialectical negation is effected outside human

consciousness and represents a definite relationships between things and phenomena. Each opposite negates the other opposite. Thus, negation specifies the boundary of the existence of objects beyond which the given object gives way to a new one. Second, negation is internal by its nature. This means the object is subject to negation not from outside but from its own internal elements. We may say that the object negates itself. The proletariat, being a necessary element of capitalist society, is at the same time its gravedigger, its negation. Third, negation presupposes both the destruction of the old, outlived form and the preservation of the viable content of the object. It is thus a moment of connection in development. The old never disappears in full and absolutely, it is transformed in the course of negation, preserving its rational (accumulated, so to say) content. The new, therefore, is not an absolute rejection of the old, but a further development of all that is viable. That is why development represents the ascending movement. This feature of dialectical negation makes it possible to reveal an important feature of progress. Not all that is new is progressive. Progressive is only that new which is of necessity born by the old and absorbs all the strength of the old. In his time, Lenin subjected to severe criticism attempts to create a proletarian culture in post-revolutionary Russia without making use of the best traditions of Russian and foreign culture. Similarly, the socialist revolution preserves the productive forces of the bourgeois society to develop them further and abolishes its outmoded relations of production. And fourth, negation is always concrete, that is effected in conformity with the concrete nature, essence of an object.

Idealistic understanding rules out the existence of negation in the objective reality itself and considers it a subjective act, performed in human mind, or accepts objective negation as a metaphor. The metaphysical understanding of negation fails to see its complicated contradictory nature and regards it as a one-sided rejection, as an absolutely negative act. Given this understanding of negation, it is impossible to depict the law-governed character of development in nature, society, including the history of human culture.

The concept of dialectical negation helps to reveal the following logical pattern in the development of objects and phenomena of reality. If as a result of any dialectical negation, an object (or its some state) passes into its opposite, then the repeated negation, that is, the negation of this resultant opposite must restore initial state disappeared in consequence of the first negation. But since every time dialectical negation preserves the positive content of the negated, then as a result of the second negation a full return to the initial state becomes impossible. Thus, we obtain three qualitatively different and at the same time identical stages in development: thesis, negation (or antithesis) and the negation of negation (or synthesis). Antithesis is identical to thesis in content, since it preserves its content and continues to accumulate the latter. Synthesis is identical to antithesis in content, since it, in its turn, preserves the accumulated content of antithesis, but coincides in form with thesis, as if placing the object back to its initial state on a new basis - on the basis of accumulated content. Therefore, the coincidence of forms here is only relative, not absolute.

The law of the negation of negation reflects the universal structure of all things, phenomena and processes. The negation of negation is nothing else but the unity of opposites, i.e. thesis and antithesis. This aspect of the law of the negation of negation informs us of whether the processes under review are all-embracing or completed. For example, it is erroneous to consider revolution as the one that has come to fruition, if revolutionary changes cover only the economic sphere and ignore social ideology and culture spheres, and unless a new relation of unity sets in between them through the respective intermediate links (various institutions, organisations, etc.).

Thus, the law of the negation of negation operates both on historical and structural plane. It operates in all spheres of reality, including the subjective one. Engels proved the universal character of the law of the negation of negation while criticising Duhring. He wrote: "And so, what is the negation of the negation? An extremely general

and for this reason extremely far-reaching and important - law of development of nature, history, and thought; a law which, as we have seen, holds good in the animal and plant kingdoms, in geology, in mathematics, in history and in philosophy..."¹

However, it is not suffice to remember and learn the general features of the law of the negation of negation. This is only a formula a person has to know how to use it. In any science general formulas cannot be used automatically. This is the object of speculation by bourgeois critics of materialist dialectics, claiming that the formula "thesis-antithesis-synthesis" is scant, hollow, schematic, and ineffective.

And so, the law of the negation of negation determines the onward, ascending line of development, the continuity between the old that is negated and the new that negates, the difference of progressive from reactionary, retrograde changes, and conditions the preservation, in the development, of the sound and viable elements accumulated in the previous development stages and the repetition, on a higher basis, of the general features of the earlier development stages by imparting a spiral-like form to the latter.

1. F. Engels, Anti-Dühring, p. 168.

4. Non-Basic Laws of Dialectics

The basic laws of materialist dialectics characterise the most general connections in development. But the substance of all connections in the latter is not exhausted by the basic laws of dialectics. They always operate in a special form of connections which are revealed through the non-basic laws of dialectics. The latter express the multiformity of the connections in development and its comprehensiveness. Their operation includes the action of the basic laws of dialectics and imparts to them a concrete form.

The Law of the Unity of Content and Form

Content is a totality of internal elements that comprise the object. Internal elements can be called the sub-

stance of the object, or its substantial content, to be more exact. Various objects possess different content, depending on the elements that comprise it. For example, in case of a chemical substance atoms are its content; in case of a mode of production, productive forces; and in case of political power, ruling social groups. Content is the mobile aspect of the object, it changes continually and is subject to a quantitative evaluation. It is clear from the above examples that the quantity of atoms may be different, and the level of productive forces may also be different, while the social groups, including the classes, may be small, large or massive.

The form may be internal and external. The law of the unity of content and form involves the internal form as a specific structure, a totality of connections which organise the elements of content into some wholeness. If we take the working class, we shall see that it consists of different categories (elements) - the industrial proletariat, the agricultural proletariat, the workers employed in the sphere of trade, etc. What makes all these groups a definite class is that they are deprived of the means and instruments of production. Their interrelations are realised through production and trade unions. The workers' political parties attest to that the working class is organised to the highest degree.

And although parties are only the external form of the internal organisation of the working class, we may judge about the degree to which the working class is organised in a country.

The productive forces of any society constitute the content of the mode of production, while the relations of production - its internal form, that is, they organise the productive forces into a definite mode of production, into a certain wholeness.

According to the law of the unity of content and form, content determines form. Since content is in a state of development, the old, outdated form is periodically replaced by a new, more developed and improved form, depending on the degree of the development of content. Thus, development as a whole is a chain of the mutually replacing internal forms of the organisation of the object's content. Throughout history, a change in the class content of state power resulted in the improvement of the apparatus of power, the appearance of special legislative bodies, the alteration of the correlation between the executive and legislative bodies of state power, etc. regardless of the external forms of state power - the monarchy, republic, theocracy, etc. The external form often screens various content. Therefore, the working class that assumes power is not content with the proclamation of a republic. Even in the most democratic bourgeois republic the working class and its allies have to break up the bourgeois state machinery, i.e. to overcome the gap between the legislative and executive wings of power, disband the permanent section of the army (various privileged Guards), etc. Over the period between the February and the October Revolutions of 1917 in Russia, the enemies of the Revolution tries to use the form of Soviets in their interests by proclaiming the slogan "Soviets without Bolsheviks!" When people confuse the internal and external forms, they often give erroneous appraisal of the process of historical development. During the Great French Revolution of 1789-1794 widely current was illusion that the Roman Republic was to be restored.

The metaphysical understanding of the correlation between form and content lies in the divorce of form from content and in considering it the object's aspect independent of the content. It is the platform of reactionary forces, striving to preserve the society's old production relations despite progress in the development of the productive forces. It is the basis of formal art which elevates into an absolute the form's relative independence of content. It is the basis of bureaucracy which does not see the substance of the matter behind its form. A metaphysical approach can also be seen in the absolutisation of content and neglect for the form's activity in relation to content. Meanwhile, the form not only promotes development but may also contain the latter. The matter is whether form corresponds to content or whether it is in a "conflict", discord, with it. Unrealistic art is incompatible with progressive content, i.e. with relevant progressive ideas, pertinent moral and social problems, etc. The reactionary bourgeoisie takes interest in such trends in art which adversely influence its content. In the sphere of state-building, the accomplishment of the tasks of socialist construction depends on the choice of an appropriate political form of the organisation of proletarian dictatorship.

The Law of the Unity of
Essence and Appearance

The essence is sometimes understood as an important, determining part of content. But this is a common concept-

ion of essence transferred from ordinary life to science, to philosophy. In the system of materialist dialectics the essence is a totality of all internal and necessary elements and their connections in the object. Hence, the essence is the unity of form and content. In terms of its essence the socialist mode of production fundamentally differs from the capitalist mode of production, say, in such countries as the USSR and the USA, and not so much because their productive forces are different, but because their relations of production are diametrically opposite. It must be said that the internal form, and not the external form of its display, determines essence. As Lenin wrote, "Form is essential."

Essence is formed."¹

The form of the object determines its essence directly. But since the form itself is determined by content, the essence is ultimately determined by its content. At the same time, essence is not reduced to a sum total of internal form and content, but represents a definite unity of form and content taken in respect of the external form of display. On top of all this, essence is the internal aspect of the object which is bound to display itself externally. Appearance is the form of the external display of essence, i.e. its external form. Figuratively speaking, appearance shows how essence appears "on the surface of the world".

Essence in itself, in a "pure form", does not exist. In reality it is part and parcel of specific, concrete forms of its existence - of appearance. Only in unity with forms of its manifestation essence is real. For example, surplus value appropriated by the capitalist always takes the form of profit and does not exist in reality outside this form. Equally, any law is nowhere given in a general form; it takes on a special, specific form of display. In a general form, a law is available for the human mind only as a product of abstraction from real and concrete connections and processes.

However, we should not hold that essence or appearance do not exist objectively. In the history of philosophy we may encounter different viewpoints on this score. Empirical idealists believed that only our sensations are real, or, to be more exact, only their reflections are real, whereas general concepts do not reflect anything. From this standpoint, capitalism as such does not exist in reality. What exists is only various external connections, which do not express anything general. This point of view was especially clearly expressed by positivists in the 1920s and 1930s, who declared the material connections and relations, concealed behind external appearances, to be metaphysical, objects non-existent in reality evincing no scientific interest. In

1. V.I. Lenin, Collected Works, Vol. 38, p. 144.

Kantian philosophy, essence was divorced from appearance and was declared to be objective and unrecognisable thing-in-itself, whereas appearance, the manifestation of essence was declared to be subjective, available to cognition.

Appearance and essence do not coincide; sometimes appearance even distorts essence. For instance, we see the Sun revolving around the Earth, since in the mornings it rises and in evenings it sets. We know, however, that it is the Earth that revolves around its axis. Does this mean that the Sun does not move objectively in respect of the Earth, as we perceive this. No, it does not. The Sun moves objectively in respect of the Earth (the matter concerns a point of reference) and the observer of the Sun. Therefore, our perception of the length of the Sun's movement is quite objective. It is only incomplete, and we, therefore, come to a fallacious conclusion regarding the actual correlation of the movements of the Sun and the Earth. In the same manner our perception of a pencil submerged in water and seeming to be curved is not completely subjective, although it remains to be straight. We perceive the effect of light rays, which is objective. Similarly, when the capitalist pays the worker his wage at the end of a week, it seems that the employer pays his work, not the value of his labour power alone. Objectively, the capitalist pays a wage to the worker upon the expiry of a definite working time and not in his imagination. Therefore, the seeming picture and essence exist objectively. What is subjective is not the seeming picture, but illusion. The former differs from the latter in that it exists objectively and distorts the essence of objects. Illusion exists only in our imagination, in consciousness. The seeming picture is the form in which essence manifests itself, while illusion has no bearing on essence.

Neither the seeming picture nor appearance coincide with essence. But the latter does not distort essence in all cases. Therefore, behind every form in which essence is displayed we must see what constitutes the internal, concealed aspect of an object or process. According to Marx, science would be superfluous if appearance and essence coincided immediately. The task of science is to penetrate into and reveal

the inner laws of phenomena, without pondering too much on the external form in which essence displays itself.

This tenet is of great importance for people's practice. As Lenin wrote, "appearance is richer and essence is deeper". It is clear from this that having cognised any law, we may apply it practically in most diverse forms, depending on the conditions of its application. For instance, airliners' flights obey to the laws of aerodynamics as birds do. But man has imparted a different form to the flying machines, relying on the material at his disposal, the needs of transportation, and so on. Therefore, in the case of the flights of aircraft and rockets, the laws of aerodynamics operate in an essentially different form than in the case of birds.

This demarcation is of great importance not only for technology, but also for revolutionary social practice. The laws of social development operate objectively and inexorably in different countries, but revolutionary parties impart to their operation such an external form of application which in optimal terms promotes the accelerated running of the revolutionary process. In some cases the dictatorship of the proletariat takes on the form of a Soviet republic, in others - of people's democracy and in still others - of parliament, etc. The misapprehension of the multiformity of the manifestations of essence, which in different conditions cannot display itself in a similar manner, results in blindly following the experience of socialist construction (even if it is the best one) without any modification. The multiformity of the manifestations of essence is thus the reason why essence and appearance do not coincide.

As the dialectics of the relation between form and content shows, the essence develops continually both in quantitative and qualitative terms. The contradiction between content and form is the internal source of the development of essence. Capitalism gradually evolved from its inception and till our day. And although the essence of pre-monopoly capitalism did not undergo any fundamental change, this does not mean that monopoly capitalism does not differ essentially from the former.

Cognition of essence is not a simple, one-stage process; it begins with the transition from appearance to essence. The second stage is the cognition of essence separately from the forms of its manifestation - as a system of general laws. The very essence is multi-stage, and cognition moves, so to say, from the essence of first order to the essence of second order, from the essence of second order to the essence of third order, etc. The third stage of cognition of the object sees the transition from essence in a "pure form", so to say, to necessary special forms of its manifestation. At this stage the essence is already revealed in concrete forms of its movement. For instance, it was not suffice to divulge the secret of surplus value, for it still contradicts individual empirical facts. It was necessary, on the basis of the laws of surplus value, to reveal that concrete type in which essence is actual, real. In such concepts as profit, rent, interest, commercial capital, credit Marx showed concrete forms in which surplus value is manifested in the empirical world of facts.

Marx revealed the essence of capital in a systematic form, and Lenin - the essence of imperialism. In a similar manner, natural scientists build theoretical systems that show up the essence of the object under study in the unity of its general structure with particular forms of reality.

Reality and Possibility

In their totality essence and external forms of its manifestation make up the re-

ality of the object. Reality covers both the internal side of things and objects and their external side. In a broad sense, reality represents the whole of the objective world and in a narrow sense - the objective existence of the object. The possibility is an aspect of the object, its abstract self-negation. It is objective like the reality and represents a really existing general form of the object's being, a form devoid of substantial content. What does it mean? It means that possibility represents the abstract structure of a new object which did not subordinate to itself all its elements. For example, the appearance of money led to the split of commodity exchange into two acts: sale and

purchase. This economic structure is impregnant with the possibility of a crisis of overproduction, since the owner of a commodity may retain money after selling it and in this case another commodity will be unrealised. But this possibility does not become reality until the onset of capitalism, because the exchange in pre-capitalist socio-economic formations did not become a universal economic relationship and did not make real the very possibility of a crisis. In the same way, the nature of social production under capitalism helps us to predict the structure of socialist production, though abstract and devoid of general content that is made up by public property.

The possibility should be distinguished from impossibility which contradicts the objective laws of the existence and movement of the object. Like possibility, impossibility is definite, because what is impossible in a given set of conditions may become possible in a different set of conditions. However, that which contradicts the most general laws of the development of any reality is impossible in general, that is under no circumstances. Matter cannot disappear, time cannot be stopped, etc.

The possibility, existing outside definite conditions of its realisation, is abstract. The possibility becomes real when requisite conditions of its realisation make their appearance. The possibility of a socialist revolution is real in any industrialised capitalist country. In poorly developed countries this possibility is abstract. This explains why such countries at the outset face national democratic revolutions, which prepare, at a faster rate, the ground for socialist revolutions. The abstract possibility of crises of overproduction and monetary crises existed even before capitalism, but only under this system it becomes real, since capitalism provides conditions for turning this possibility into reality.

However, something else is needed to turn the possibility into reality, besides conditions for the realisation of this process. Conditions may be more or less favourable and determine the degree of probability of turning the possibility into reality. To make possibility a reality the operation

of a cause is required. Under modern conditions, when imperialism still persists, there is a real possibility of a world war. Nevertheless, it is so far not realised thanks to the effort of peace supporters, of the world socialist system, with the result that the action of causes engendering wars is blocked. In consequence of this, the upper hand is taken by another possibility - the possibility of peace. Peace supporters set the task of making international detente irreversible, that is, of turning the real possibility of war into an abstract. The disappearance of imperialism rules out the possibility of wars. Take another example: all conditions are available in developed capitalist countries for their transition to socialism, but a socialist revolution does not take place there due to the absence of a real cause. The cause begins to operate in a revolutionary situation, which includes both the objective and subjective moments that will be dealt with in a corresponding section of historical materialism. Now, however, it will be pertinent to note that even in a revolutionary situation the possibility of a revolution is not always realised, since the operation of diametrically opposite causes may lead (and sometimes does lead) to the realisation of the opposite possibility, that of preserving the status quo. In the period of transition from capitalism to socialism, two opposite possibilities collide: the possibility of building socialism and the possibility of capitalist restoration. Therefore, the efforts undertaken by the working people headed by the working class and under the leadership of communist and workers' parties are the decisive reason for the realisation of the possibility of giving rise to a socialist society.

The possibility not only automatically does not become reality, but it may remain to be unrealised. In the set of possibilities, including the opposite ones, the upper hand is taken by those, whose causes of realisation have proved to be the most effective. We must make a distinction not only between the abstract and the real possibility, but also between the necessary and the accidental possibility. The necessary possibility is not identical to the real one. The real possibility may be (and often happens to be) accidental. The

necessary possibilities are bound to turn into reality. The possibility of socialism's victory on a global scale is to be realised without fail; in other words, it will turn into reality as a result of world history. This process may be held up but not brought to a halt.

Cause and Effect

The antithesis between the possibility and reality is, in a way, overcome in the

concept of cause. The cause is thus a unity of the possibility and reality. The cause is a phenomenon, event or circumstance, which transfers any possibility into reality and calls it to life.

But how does it come about? The cause fills the possibility (abstract form) with a substantial content and theory transfers it into reality. The cause is nothing else but a substantial relation. For instance, a billiard-ball striking against another either stops or loses a definite quantity of motion. Another ball begins to move. Its movement is the consequence of a strike of another ball. But why is it so? Because the first ball "gave" it a definite quantity of motion. In social life, people's practical activity is such a substantial basis for all changes and events. All social phenomena, objects and relations are the result of human (labour, revolutionary, spiritual) activity.

But the cause is not identical to a given substance (general basis of phenomena). It is the motion of substance in a definite form. Therefore, the turning of cause into effect is the replacement of the forms of motion of a definite substance. For instance, an artist's spiritual and material work results in a definite picture, which differs in form from the cause of its creation - the artist's activity. His activity is live activity, but his picture is the reified activity of the same artist. Cause and effect differ in form and are identical in substantial content. Equally, the commodity is the reified labour of a worker, the transmuted form of his activity. In nature, any phenomenon is a transmuted form of any substantial motion.

In order to apprehend the causal connection as an internal and not external nexus one must understand the con-

nexion with a substantial relation. For this reason Lenin stressed that the "actual cognition of the cause is the deepening of knowledge from the externality of phenomena to the substance."¹

In modern science, Laplacian determinism should be distinguished from probabilistic causality. According to Laplacian determinism, we can fully foresee a result at every moment if we know the initial data, whereas in some cases (as, for example, in quantum mechanics) we cannot foretell unequivocally the result of any process, although we know its initial data. Therefore, the result of a given process is predicted with a definite probability whose sphere is indicated in an exact way. The fact that science cannot foretell exactly the behaviour of separate elementary particles at every moment or of separate molecules of gas, when its pressure on a vessel's walls is measured, cannot serve as a ground for negating causality in general, as many modern idealists do by restoring the old classical conceptions of the past idealists - Hume, Kant, Mach, Avenarius and others.

Laplacian determinism is merely the simplest type of the causal connection of phenomena. Probabilistic causality is another type of this nexus. But the multiformity of the kinds of determinism is not exhausted by them. Cognition will reveal ever new types of causal connection and all of them will include the simplest type of causal nexus as a subservient moment. There is no such nexus in the world which would not include causality.

The contraposition between cause and effect is relative in the sense that cause may play the part of effect and vice versa. In the chain of cause and effect relations, any subsequent phenomenon becomes effect in relation to the previous phenomenon and is the cause in relation to the subsequent phenomenon. But the contraposition between cause and effect is also relative in another sense. Effect often exerts a reciprocal action on its cause, acting as its cause in relation to changes taking place in the phenomenon that served as its cause. We thus see a kind of interaction between cause

1. V.I. Lenin, Collected Works, Vol. 38, p. 159.

and effect. This interaction proves to be a final cause of the development of the object. For instance, historical circumstances give rise to a definite type of the individual, for in reality he is the product of historical circumstances. In his turn, the individual transforms these circumstances by acting on them. Marx called the coincidence of changes in people and in historical circumstances revolutionary practice. The final cause of the historical process is the interaction of people and historical circumstances. As distinct from the immediate cause, the final cause is a contradiction, i.e. an interaction of opposites.

In conclusion, we must draw a distinction between functional connection, occasion and cause. Functional connection is an abstract dependence of two or more parameters or properties, under which one of them acts as an independent variable (argument), while the other acts as a dependent (function). Both members of dependence are variables whose numerical values change. If we consider the radius as an argument and the circumference as a function, then the increase in the radius involves the increase in the circumference, and the decrease of the former results in the decrease of the latter. But since this dependence is abstract, the causal connection is concealed: the radius is not necessarily a cause of change in the circumference. A change in the spread of a pair of compasses or something else may be an actual cause of changes both in the circumference and the radius. If time is argument in the formula of movement's velocity, while the distance covered is function, it does not follow from this that time is the cause of change in the distance. The actual cause lies in the movement of a definite object — man, machine, planet, etc. Functional connection is only a formal expression of real connection, the underlying feature of which is causality. This does not mean that functional connection does not exist objectively in reality. It is objective, but it does not exhaust the structure of the real (even the simplest) connection of the real world, and only represents its particular side and has no independent significance.

Occasion also differs from causal connection, for it is its subjective expression. Usually the occasion is con-

nected with a definite objective fact or event, which, it is true, is not a cause for subsequent events but is passed for such.

Necessity and Chance

In Dialectics of Nature Engels noted that inactive cause is not cause. This phrase

contains the idea that the connection between cause and its action is necessary. And in fact necessity removes the opposition between cause and its action. This means that if there is a cause, there must be effect therefrom.

What, then is necessity? Necessity is the connection which is bound to make its appearance under relevant conditions. Causal connection is the most general and simplest form of necessary connection. But necessity is not reduced to a causal relation alone. All the aforementioned laws of dialectics are but different types of necessary connections. Necessity may be internal and external. External necessity is linked with internal necessity and is its manifestation. The mode of interaction of the living organism with the environment bears a necessary character for it, for without this interaction the organism cannot exist. Nevertheless this mode of interaction is determined by internal specific requirements and the laws of physiology of the organism.

Necessity is opposed to chance. Chance is a form in which necessity manifests itself. But since necessity is manifested in different forms, a given chance, as distinct from necessity, must not take place without fail under the same conditions. All people are mortal, but they die in different, accidental circumstances, including natural death at a veritable age. Engels wrote that after the French Revolution of 1789 France needed a strong personality in order to complete social reforms and counteract the reactionary European surroundings. And since this historical need existed, a relevant personality made his appearance on the scene. It was Napoleon, but his personality was a pure accident. Another personality instead of him might appear on the scene, may be less or more talented. Nevertheless, such a personality had to appear.

Consequently, in a "pure form" necessity does not exist but always acts in some accidental form. Therefore, accident is a necessary addition to necessity itself. Accident is always conditioned, that is, it always has its own cause. There are no causeless phenomena. For this reason any accidental phenomenon is causally conditioned. What makes accidental a given phenomenon is the intersection of one chain of cause and effect relations with another one.

By calling as chances particular forms of the manifestation of this or that necessity, we must bear in mind that chances are of great importance for man both from the cognitive and practical points of view. From the times immemorial the correlation between accident and necessity was studied by man, who drew appropriate conclusions from this study. By the concept of predestination and by making use of the identification of accident and necessity religion tried to persuade people that everything takes place at God's will and not by chance and that people should obey his vice-regents in order not to fall into his disgrace. Thus, fatalism elevates accident into necessity. It dooms man to passivity, since it places the results of his actions in dependence on non-existing super-natural forces and not on himself and his activity. On the other hand, the French materialists - Holbach, Helvetius and others - reduced necessity to the level of the game of chances by claiming that any chance, even the most insignificant one, may have a decisive influence on the course of history.

Dialectical materialism holds that science is the enemy of chances in the sense that it must penetrate into the accidental form of phenomena in order to reveal necessity concealed behind a fortuitous form. On the other hand, it is necessity that may give a scientific explanation to chances which may have great importance for society.

The Singular, Particular
and Universal

Manifesting through
diverse forms of its existence, necessity represents a

common basis for particular cases which have a special and even singular character. Is any form of the manifestation of necessity accidental or do we have here a more complex

correlation than the one we have considered?

The aspects of an empirically existing object taken singly constitute the singular. Every individual empirically given object possesses inimitable features, properties, etc. Its specifically singular properties always have an accidental character. But in addition to singular properties every individual object has universal properties and features which are inherent in other individual objects. Thus, a separate object is the unity of the universal and the singular. Therefore, the universal does not exhaust the individual. As Lenin wrote, the "universal exists only in the individual and through the individual. Every individual is (in one way or another) a universal. Every universal is (a fragment, or an aspect, or the essence of) an individual."¹ The universal is regarded as similar in every-day life. The universal taken and regarded as similar features or properties of objects and phenomena helps us to differentiate the accidental from the necessary in practice, since here the accidental is identified with the singular, and the universal with the necessary, recurrent. But in theoretical cognition and in revolutionary practice the universal is something more complex than only the similar in objects, although it does not follow from this that the similar is not the universal.

What is the universal in a deeper sense? The universal is the law of the existence and motion of the particular and, consequently, the singular. For instance, according to Kepler's law, planets must move according to an ellipsis. But the planet of Uranus does not move strictly according to an ellipsis. This phenomenon was explained by the British astronomer John Adams (1819-1892) and the French astronomer Urbain J. Le Verrier (1811-1877) on the basis of the law of gravitation. The planet Neptune's gravitation strongly affects the Uranus trajectory. Thus, the law of gravitation is the common basis both for the elliptical movement of planets and for every accidental diversion of planets from the elliptical trajectory. Here we see how the univer-

¹. V.I. Lenin, Collected Works, Vol. 38, p. 359.

sal determines the particular and through the particular the singular. The universal is the gravitation, the particular is the elliptical movement of planets and the singular is the empirically given diversions (both essential and inessential) and other specific features (the size of the ellipsis, etc.) of the trajectory of moving planets. Take another example. In Marx's Capital the law of surplus value is the common basis for all economic phenomena of pre-monopoly capitalism. Profit which is deduced from surplus-value as a common basis is a special form of the movement of capital, whereas the empirically given separate capitals represent the singular. Equally, the ground-rent is the particular, which is explained on the basis of surplus value as the universal, while the separate empirically existing rent is the singular, fortuitous manifestation of the universal (law).

Thus, the particular is the necessary form of the manifestation of the universal, whereas the singular is already a fortuitous form of the manifestation of the universal. A consistently scientific approach requires the explanation of the singular on the basis of the universal but through the particular. A direct adaptation of the universal to the singular is formalism and scholasticism in science, and in politics it may lead to the rejection of the scientific and theoretical principles, since the singular often contradicts the universal. Revisionism usually speculates on these contradictions between the universal and the singular, by "revising" and renouncing the universal principles on the sole ground that in the empirical world everything looks like differently. The contraposition of the singular and the universal sooner or later leads to revisionism in ideology.

The practice of socialist construction has provided the examples of a proper combination of the singular and the universal. The Communist and Workers' parties of socialist countries creatively apply the laws of building a new society with due account of concrete conditions and specific features of their respective countries.

5. The Dialectics of Development of Socialism

Dialectics is of special importance for analysing the building of the socialist and communist society. Socialism is the most dynamic social system that has ever existed; it is the most developing one, being in the state of constant change, movement and improvement. The progressive-onward movement of the economy, social relations, culture and their constant transformation on communist lines is the law of life in a socialist society.

Antagonism and Contradictions Under Socialist Construction

Bourgeois ideologists make abortive attempts to prove that materialist dialectics has stopped at the threshold of socialism. Their statements to the effect that Marxists-Leninists deny the operation of the basic laws of dialectics in a socialist society are groundless.

On the other hand, the assertions of Left extremists that antagonistic contradictions are inherent both in capitalism and socialism are no less untenable. Their further statements that under socialism the people and the working classes are split by the same irreconcilably opposite interests as are the bourgeoisie and the workers in bourgeois society hold no water and are dangerous as well.

The socialist revolution, socialist and communist construction are a brilliant confirmation of the laws of materialist dialectics discovered by Marxism. This is graphic evidence of the inevitable resolution of the bourgeois society's antagonistic contradictions by revolution, of a radical change of quality characterising the socio-economic and political systems, of the shift to a higher stage of social development as a result of the negation of the bourgeois order based on private ownership and of the establishment of a socialist system based on public ownership.

At the same time, the socialist society as a society of a historically new type which came up to take the place of the exploiter societies which dominated for many centuries

Under socialism where classes and social groups share the same basic interests which, in their turn, coincide with those of the state, contradictions are resolved not on the basis of class struggle but through the joint efforts of all classes and social strata under the guidance of a Marxist-Leninist party. The very character of socio-political life is contradictory, since it contains in itself the new and the old, the advanced and the backward, the conservative and the progressive.

The socialist society as a society of high social activity is marked by the dialectics of development from the lower to the higher, which finds its manifestation in the consciously directed tendency of taking up ever higher qualitative stages of development on the basis of the dialectical negation of the previous forms. The law of the negation of negation, of the radical replacement of the former quality by a new one most clearly manifests itself in the period of transition from capitalism to socialism. This stage sees the radical change in the nature of property, the social structure and the political system.

Lenin's teaching on breaking down the bourgeois state machinery reflects the operation of the law of the negation of negation during the transition from the bourgeois political system and bourgeois democracy to the socialist political system and socialist democracy. The working class cannot wield the old state machinery which served the cause of oppression of the working people. It must create a new state that would meet the interests of the working people and be able to effect socialist and communist transformations.

But materialist dialectics links the concept of negation with notion of the further development of a thing, phenomenon or object. In social life, people in most cases deal with not mechanical negation, but with the negation which has a bearing on the preservation of the viable elements of the former stages of development, with the retention of the ties between the departing old and the succeeding new.

The breakdown of the bourgeois state machinery does not mean at all that the entire political mechanism is smashed completely. After the revolution the people retain and

has, naturally, its own specific features of the manifestation and operation of materialist dialectics laws. This concerns above all the question of the nature and mechanism of overcoming contradictions under socialism.

Lenin stressed the specific nature of the operation of the law of the unity and conflict of opposites under socialism. He wrote: "Antagonism and contradiction is not the same thing: the first is to disappear under socialism and the latter is to remain."¹

We must draw a distinction between different periods of the establishment and development of the socialist society. In the initial period of the transition from capitalism to socialism there are still the antagonistic classes: the deposed bourgeoisie and the landlords, on the one hand, and the working class and other labouring classes and strata, on the other. Naturally, at this stage there are antagonistic contradictions inside the society and the class struggle continues to be a method of their resolution.

The situation changes after socialism has been built. The abolition of the exploiting classes, the emergence and development of a society consisting exclusively of the working people creates new, unprecedented forms of the community of interests on all cardinal issues of economic, social and political life. The existing differences between the interests of various classes and social groups, and individuals do not bear the nature of antagonism and are resolved on the basis of the conscious activity of the society, its political system and the party that combines in its policy the multifaceted interests of the population groups with those of the society as a single whole. In socialist society contradictions are objectively non-antagonistic; this conforms to the nature of society where there are no social forces with opposite interests. However, the wrong policy and subjectivist errors may also become here a source of deepening contradictions and even social conflicts.

1. Lenin Miscellany XI, Moscow-Leningrad, 1931, p. 357.

Under socialism where classes and social groups share the same basic interests which, in their turn, coincide with those of the state, contradictions are resolved not on the basis of class struggle but through the joint efforts of all classes and social strata under the guidance of a Marxist-Leninist party. The very character of socio-political life is contradictory, since it contains in itself the new and the old, the advanced and the backward, the conservative and the progressive.

The socialist society as a society of high social activity is marked by the dialectics of development from the lower to the higher, which finds its manifestation in the consciously directed tendency of taking up ever higher qualitative stages of development on the basis of the dialectical negation of the previous forms. The law of the negation of negation, of the radical replacement of the former quality by a new one most clearly manifests itself in the period of transition from capitalism to socialism. This stage sees the radical change in the nature of property, the social structure and the political system.

Lenin's teaching on breaking down the bourgeois state machinery reflects the operation of the law of the negation of negation during the transition from the bourgeois political system and bourgeois democracy to the socialist political system and socialist democracy. The working class cannot wield the old state machinery which served the cause of oppression of the working people. It must create a new state that would meet the interests of the working people and be able to effect socialist and communist transformations.

But materialist dialectics links the concept of negation with notion of the further development of a thing, phenomenon or object. In social life, people in most cases deal with not mechanical negation, but with the negation which has a bearing on the preservation of the viable elements of the former stages of development, with the retention of the ties between the departing old and the succeeding new.

The breakdown of the bourgeois state machinery does not mean at all that the entire political mechanism is smashed completely. After the revolution the people retain and

develop many political institutions which were born already in the womb of the old society - workers' and other labour parties, trade unions and other political associations, retain the public sector of the economy, which is the basis for socialising private property. But this is not all. The working class seeks to retain all the best that has been accumulated before the revolution in terms of administrative experience, to wield the production apparatus, the mechanism of economic and scientific management, and the sphere of social services. The use of these elements of the state apparatus makes it possible to accomplish the revolution with minimum costs and ensure at once a higher efficiency of social production and improve the living conditions. Lenin wrote: "Not empty negation, not futile negation, not sceptical negation is characteristic and essential in dialectics, - which undoubtedly contains the element of negation and indeed as its most important element - no, but negation as a moment of connection, as a moment of development, retaining the positive... ."¹

Socialist democracy not only denies bourgeois democracy but also preserves the continuity in respect of revolutionary democratic principles which were proclaimed by the most radical forces in the period of bourgeois revolutions. It develops in the interests of the working people the old ideas such as freedom and equality of people, brotherhood, internationalism, friendship and equality of nations, popular sovereignty, and fills these ideas with new, real content.

We have already spoken about this kind of continuity which benefits the new, socialist society. But there is continuity of a different kind, which forces its way despite the counteraction of the leading political forces. In the first Soviet years Lenin repeatedly pointed to bureaucratic elements in the Soviet state apparatus, which were the result not only of the society's economic backwardness but also of

1. V.I. Lenin, Collected Works, Vol. 38, p. 225.

the direct borrowing of certain traditions that were customary for the old government machine.¹ The struggle against bureaucracy and other negative traditions left over from the old regime constitutes a major condition for the effective functioning of the socialist political system.

The 1957 Declaration of the Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties of the socialist countries formulated the following warning in a spirit of the Marxist-Leninist traditional dialectical analysis: "Should the Marxist political party in its examination of questions base itself not on dialectics and materialism, the result will be one-sidedness and subjectivism, stagnation of human thought, isolation from life and loss of ability to make the necessary analysis of things and phenomena,² revisionist and dogmatist mistakes and mistakes in policy."

Materialist dialectics is the best guarantee against such mistakes. It bears a creative, revolutionary nature both in respect of cognition and change of reality.

Dialectics of Developed Socialism

Under developed socialism, the operation of the laws of materialist dialectics has

its specific features. A high degree of development achieved by socialism on its own basis, on the basis of its economic, social and political systems, the formation of a society with social homogeneity, of a single people, in a word, the assertion of all trends that strengthen the society's social, moral and political unity in no way abrogate the operation of the laws of dialectics. But the emergent contradictions have new forms and are resolved by different means than at the stage of building socialism. These contradictions are resolved not on the basis of class struggle and "deepening" the revolution, but on the basis of the conscious activity of the entire society, its guiding political forces aimed at the constant stimulation of progress in all spheres of life. However, we must bear in mind that social contradictions affect not only the relations between classes, but also dif-

1. See V.I. Lenin, Collected Works, Vol. 33, p. 501.

2. The Struggle for Peace, Democracy and Socialism, Moscow, 1963, p. 15.

ferent aspects of social life.

Full communism is the "negation" of socialism, but this "negation" has a specific character: it describes two stages in the development of one and the same system. Nevertheless, at this stage, too, there are contradictions, there is struggle for their resolution, the latter being an important internal source of the system's self-development.

A pride of place under developed socialism is taken by the contradiction between the new and the old, the elimination of obsolescent orders, the overcoming of routine and bigotry and the solution of the ever more complex tasks of improving new life. This chiefly involves contradictions of growth associated with the permanent progress of the productive forces for the sake of satisfying most fully the material and spiritual needs of people.

Developed socialism implies the overcoming of contradictions that do not meet the aims of restructuring society on the principles of full communism.

In the sphere of the economy this is connected with the resolution of contradictions between the tempestuous growth of the productive forces, the requirements of the scientific and technological revolution, on the one hand, and the lagging behind of forms and methods of administration and socio-economic planning, on the other hand, with the overcoming of contradictions between the socialist property forms - public, cooperative and collective-farm and the property of social organisations - and with the formation of a single form of property.

In the sphere of social relations this is connected with the elimination of the still essential distinctions between the working class, the peasantry and the people's intelligentsia, between mental and physical labour, between town and country on the basis of the formation and consolidation of the society's unity and homogeneity.

The gap between different levels of labour remuneration, which is inevitable under socialism, is a source of contradictions, which are resolved by a social policy aimed at securing the steady growth of labour productivity as a source of social wealth, at raising wages for low-paid work-

ers, at increasing social funds as an important means on the path of achieving communist abundance.

In the sphere of national relations this is connected with the overcoming of the contradiction between nationalist manifestations left over from the past and the general tendency of strengthening the unity of all peoples on the basis of internationalism.

The 1977 Constitution of the USSR is a model of the operation of the leading political forces aimed at bringing the political system into conformity with the level of development of the society's economic, social and cultural systems. Being an important landmark in social progress, the Constitution, at the same time, has opened up the way for the society's further advancement, for the creation of the material and technical base of communism and for the improvement of all social relations.

The dialectics of developing international relations between the socialist countries has also its specific features. The determining factor underlying these relations has been the unity based on the community of the economic systems, on the principles of Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism. Practice shows that contradictions may arise in relations between socialist countries. They may be caused by different economic and socio-political conditions in these countries, by the lack of coincidence in the stages of their development, by specific historical and international conditions. These contradictions may also manifest themselves when the leaders of the socialist countries approach their home and foreign policies in a different and contradictory way. By their objective nature these contradictions are not antagonistic, although by dint of subjective reasons they may at times reach a certain degree of acuteness. The international socialist community has created effective mechanisms to coordinate their mutual relations and international relations in the world at large, to resolve new contradictions with an eye to the unity of international and national tasks of every country, and to expand the processes of economic integration and all-round cooperation between the socialist nations.

The law of the unity and conflict of opposites is of especially great importance for comprehending the mechanism of the socialist countries' functioning on the world arena, where antagonistic and non-antagonistic contradictions make their appearance.

The modern world is the venue of acute economic and social, political and ideological contradictions between the two systems - socialist and capitalist. Never before has the struggle of opposites reached such a scale and magnitude as today and never before has the confrontation between political giants with weapons of mass annihilation between so formidable and impressive. The conflict of opposites, the acutest contradiction between the two systems on the international arena is the chief and most striking feature of society's life today.

But this does not mean that it is possible to ignore the other side of the matter. Despite the acutest contradictions that rend mankind, the latter continues to exist as a whole. Moreover, the present epoch sees the strengthening of the tendency towards closer mutual relations between different nations of the world. This is seen in the economic ties within the framework of the world market that influences the economic processes in all social structures. This is also seen in the growing scientific, technical and cultural exchanges against the background of the current revolution in science and technology. This is further seen in the solution of common human problems such as the struggle for preventing a world thermo-nuclear catastrophe, the preservation of the environment, the tapping of new energy resources, the elimination of hunger and disease in all regions of the globe, the regulation of the consequences of the demographic explosion, the overcoming of the growing gap in the levels of economic development of industrialised and developing countries and other global problems.

However, we regard as wrong the arguments advanced by the supporters of the convergence of social systems, who claim that under the impact of the scientific and technological revolution the developed countries of socialism and the developed countries of capitalism tend to converge to form

some new type of a social system that would unite the advantages of the two social systems into a single whole. The reference to the act that both under capitalism and socialism the states use the same achievements of science, the same technology and similar physical processes and even methods of organisation, ignores the substance of the social systems and the genuine dialectics of influence of scientific and technological progress on them.

The supporters of convergence reject, on a theoretical plane, the requirements of dialectics which imply the ascertainment of the general laws of the scientific and technological revolution and their specific features under capitalism and socialism.

6. Modern Bourgeois and Revisionist Distortions of Marxist-Leninist Dialectics

Already in 1844-1845, Marx and Engels showed that Hegel's idealist dialectics was fully adapted to the interests of the ruling class. According to idealist dialectics, the object is overcome, "sublated", if man has ascended over it in the "ether of pure thought". By criticising Hegel's idealist followers, young Marx emphasized that no weapon of criticism can replace criticism by arms, that a material force can be surmounted by a material force alone. And theory can turn into a material force only when it grips the masses.

Materialist dialectics was the outcome of summarising the history of science, including natural science and technology.

Materialist Dialectics and Natural Science

Back in the 19th century Engels stressed that "nature is the proof of dialectics, and it must be said for modern science that it has furnished this proof with very rich materials increasing daily, and thus has shown that, in the last resort, nature works dialectically and not metaphysically..."¹

1. F. Engels, Dialectics of Nature, p. 33.

The natural sciences are a cognitive instrument which is used to verify and confirm the tenets of materialist dialectics and develop them further. The achievements of natural science serve as a scientific basis for the development of materialist dialectics. The natural scientific basis is, of course, not the only basis for the development of philosophy (for socio-historical practice is the decisive basis for the development of philosophy), but the development of materialist dialectics is inconceivable without this basis.

The relation of materialist dialectics to the natural sciences is manifested in its functions.

Its first function is to epistemologically comprehend and generalise the data supplied by the natural sciences. This process reveals not only the universality of the tenets of dialectics but also the epistemological principles of scientific theories and their philosophical meaning. The new data of the natural sciences serve to improve philosophical concepts.

The second function of materialist dialectics is its methodological function. In Dialectics of Nature Engels wrote that "...it is precisely dialectics that constitutes the most important form of thinking for present-day natural science, for it alone offers the analogue for, and thereby the method of explaining, the evolutionary processes occurring in nature, interconnections in general, and transitions from one field of investigation to another."¹ In Materialism and Empirio-Criticism Lenin stressed the need for natural scientists to consciously adopt dialectical materialism.

By discharging its methodological function materialist dialectics promotes the development of particular sciences, including natural science. But to discharge the heuristic function it should not be directly applied to the specific material supplied by other sciences, just as in the case of the epistemological apprehension of their results, but indirectly - through the general and specific methods of these sciences.

¹ F. Engels, Dialectics of Nature, p. 43.

The third function of materialist dialectics discharged in relation to natural science concerns the world outlook. This function differs from the epistemological one by the fact that it deals with the scientist's knowledge not only of the concrete reality he studies but also of a wider system of relations, including the socio-historical reality. Materialist dialectics prompts the natural scientists to arrive at the conclusion that there are no isolated problems in the world, if even these problems seem to be purely academic. Abstract theoretical problems are associated with social problems and are filled by a historical sense and, what is most important, oblige the natural scientist to adopt a certain socio-political stand and serve definite social ideals. For example, the communist ideal is the inevitable result at which a thinker must arrive if he adheres to materialist dialectics. Therefore, Engels noted that without dialectics which had appeared earlier, within the framework of classical German philosophy, there would have been no scientific socialism.

From Dialectics to
Metaphysics

A characteristic feature of modern bourgeois philosophy is its repudiation of dialectics as a general theory and

method of philosophical thinking. Already since the latter part of the 19th century the diverse trends of bourgeois philosophy have been dominated by metaphysical views and the metaphysical method in its modern varieties. Those who hold such views deny development in nature and society but, what is most important, consider this development only as smooth evolution, reject leaps and the conflict of opposites. Their conception of development may be reduced to mere augmentation or diminution. They absolutise various concepts, try to pass them over as eternal and immutable truths and thereby negate the possibility of objective cognition.

The domination of idealism and metaphysics in modern bourgeois philosophy also determines the solution of the problems of epistemology, the questions of the possibilities and bounds of cognising the world, the forms and means of cognition, the correlation of the empirical and the logical

in cognition, the problem of truth, etc. Today agnosticism is indigenous to all trends of bourgeois philosophy, though it is manifested in them in different ways. The cause of this phenomenon was revealed by Lenin, who wrote: "When the masses of the people themselves ... begin to make history, begin to put 'principles and theories' immediately and directly into practice, the bourgeois is terrified and howls that intellect is retreating into the background... ."¹

Parallel to open, militant anti-Marxism, attempts are made to commit certain bourgeois philosophers to Marxist theory, to interpret it in peculiar terms, and to "converge" Marxist philosophy with modern idealist doctrines. However, a philosopher who actively supports the bourgeois system is, of course, unable to accept Marxism as the working class theory and its revolutionary dialectics. Taking use of Marxist philosophical ideas and categories he usually does not accept the Marxist socio-political views.

What the bourgeois ideologists and opportunists in fact counterpose to real dialectics is sophistry. The latter consists in a substitution of concepts; bourgeois ideologists resort to sophistry in order to "refute" Marxism, while opportunists use it in order to "correct" Marxism or "interpret" it in "genuine" or "authentic" way but actually to mask their true anti-Marxist views. Lenin called sophistry the "logic of opportunism."²

Another logical method of distorting Marxist dialectics by opportunism is eclecticism. This is what Lenin wrote on this score: "... The substitution of eclecticism for dialectics is the easiest way of deceiving the people. It gives an illusory satisfaction; it seems to take into account all sides of the process, all trends of development, all the conflicting influences, and so forth, whereas in reality it provides no integral and revolutionary conception of the process of social development at all."³

Eclecticism as a principle that combines in a purely out-

1. V.I. Lenin, Collected Works, Vol. 31, p. 359.

2. V.I. Lenin, Collected Works, Vol. 18, p. 333.

3. Ibid., Vol. 25, p. 405.

ward way accidental properties and characteristics of the object runs counter to the principle of dialectical contradiction. It distorts the real substance of things and processes and leads to a halfway policy of compromises in the practical solution of acute political problems. Eclecticism as a metaphysical principle is diametrically opposed to the dialectical principle of considering objects in a comprehensive way.

Neo-Positivism

In the epoch of imperialism, dialectics is criticised not only by the outspoken ideo-

logists of political reaction, but also by the theorists of social reformism inside the working-class and national liberation movements, by the ideologists of the Right and "Left" opportunism. At the beginning of the 20th century, Eduard Bernstein, a leader of German Social democracy, started to revise Marxism, primarily its philosophical principles. The revisionism by Bernstein and his followers proved to be an international phenomenon, a manifestation of bourgeois ideological influence on the working-class movement. The Bolsheviks led by Lenin launched their determined struggle against revisionism. While generalising the new experience of the class struggle and new scientific advances, the scientific revolution in physics in the first place, Lenin developed the theory of materialist dialectics. In Materialism and Empirio-Criticism Lenin demonstrated the utter insolvency of the attempts made by bourgeois philosophers E. Mach and R. Avenarius to falsify the lessons of the revolution in scientific knowledge and attack materialist dialectics. Lenin's teaching about reflection as a universal property of matter and about the dialectical process of cognition armed the revolutionary forces of the working-class movement to repulse the latest attacks of revisionists on Marxism.

Today, in the epoch of the revolutionary transition from capitalism to socialism and on a world-wide scale, the ideologists of imperialism try to use the whole arsenal of "arguments" in their criticism of the dialectics of Marxism-Leninism. Three trends in this modern "critique" merit our special attention, because they are characteristic of the reactio-

nary ideology of major political parties of the imperialist bourgeoisie and also penetrate into the ranks of the working-class and national liberation movements and serve as a philosophical basis of modern revisionism. The neo-positivist philosophers try to negate the dialectics of the contradictoriness of the connections and relations in real world, the objective idealists from the philosophic school of Neo-Thomism reject the contradictory nature of motion and the possibility, objective regularity of revolutionary, qualitative leaps in the development of nature and society, the existentialists with their anti-dialectical arguments deny the progressive direction of development and absolutise the historically transient and surmountable specific contradictions of the capitalist society.

It was Lenin who drew attention to the transformation of neo-positivism into a basic trend of bourgeois philosophy in the epoch of imperialism. By declaring materialist dialectics to be false, calling it a metaphysical theory, the neo-positivists counterpose to it the "positive" facts -- our subjective sensations and perceptions, the formal logic of thinking, the role of language in cognition, and absolutise the relativity of the results of cognition and the possibility of refuting wrong theories and views. The neo-positivists claim that contradictions exist only in human consciousness, in the discordance of people's knowledge with empirical "facts" and sense experience. The Machists, adherents of Ernst Mach's neo-positivist philosophy of empirio-criticism, which was subjected by Lenin to comprehensive criticism absolutised the role of sensations and perceptions in cognition: in their view, the world is reduced to sense experience, and this experience should be subject to criticism whose purpose is to prevent the appearance of theories that proceed from the recognition of the objective nature of the general laws of the development of nature and society, from the recognition of the objective and universal character of contradictions and the contradictoriness of the connections and relations in nature and society.

While continuing in the 1920s and 1930s the Machist line of neo-positivist philosophy, the logical neo-positi-

tivists of the Vienna circle, i.e. the philosophers, who united around M. Schlick in the Vienna University (Austria), proclaimed the logic of scientific knowledge the only subject-matter of philosophy. The logical neo-positivists assert that any contradictions may appear only between erroneous, unscientific thinking or between ordinary consciousness and the truly scientific cognition confirmed by positive sense-data.

In the 1930s and 1940s, the neo-positivists supplemented this philosophy with an "analysis of language", claiming that the language concedes the causes of possible contradictions in thought. The world always generalises what it denotes and cannot envelop all the aspects and relations of the object or its changes and development. The new neo-positivists asserted that it was necessary to change the language, to remember about its "dangers" and thus avoid any contradictions, general theories that contradict the empirical facts that can be verified by senses.

At last, soon after the Second World War, and especially in the 1970s wide currency was given to the latest variety of neo-positivist anti-dialectical philosophy, the so-called critical rationalism of Karl Popper, a British bourgeois philosopher of Austrian origin. Popper outwardly counterposes his "critical rationalism" to the materialist dialectics of Marxism-Leninism. This ideologist of imperialist reaction has proclaimed that there are no, nor can there be, any general laws of development, any laws of social development. Moreover, any recognition of objective dialectics, general laws, the essence hidden behind "positive phenomena", any objectivisation of contradictions leads to a false theory, to a "totalitarian" social system, to a closed society. This is what he wrote in his book The Open Society and its Enemies. By "open society" Popper means bourgeois democracy with its "open pluralism" of any views and opinions, save the Marxist-Leninist ones. K. Popper holds that the combination of dialectics and materialism is "by far worse than dialectical idealism"¹ and calls the proposition that "physical

1. K.R. Popper, *Conjectures and Refutations. The Growth of Scientific Knowledge*, London, 1963, p. 331.

reality develops dialectically" as "utterly dogmatic".

Popper accuses Marxists of betraying the critical anti-dogmatic nature of Marxist theory. He passes off Engels's Anti-Duhring as an example of using dialectics in the dogmatic defence of Marxism, in the "defence of the Marxist system from criticism." He writes that because of dialectics the anti-dogmatic position has disappeared and Marxism has clarified itself as dogmatism, which is sufficiently flexible due to its use of its dialectical method, in order to evade any fresh attack. Thus, he added, Marxism has become what he terms as "strong dogmatism".¹

The true meaning and motive of these arguments was revealed by the British philosopher, Communist Maurice Cornforth, who noted with irony that according to Popper Marx's anti-dogmatic position is recognised in theory but is never used in practice. Dr. Popper says that Marxists may correct their analysis, change their opinion, alter their policy and still remain orthodoxal. Because of dialectics Marxism is sufficiently "flexible" in order to evade refutation. Marxists refuse to apply their "anti-dogmatic position" to Marxism itself. Whatever the matter "Marxists persistently seek to remain Marxists".² But this is most of all not to the liking of the ideologists of capitalism who see the "dogmatism" of Marxists precisely in this.

The founders of Marxism used to say that the theory is not a dogma, but a guide to action. On this score Lenin wrote: "This classical statement stresses with remarkable force and expressiveness that aspect of Marxism which is very often lost sight of. And by losing sight of it, we turn Marxism into something one-sided, distorted and lifeless; we deprive it of its life blood; we undermine its basic theoretical foundations — dialectics, the doctrine of historical development, all-embracing and full of contradictions; we undermine its connection with the definite practical tasks of the epoch,

-
1. K.R. Popper, *Conjectures and Refutations. The Growth of Scientific Knowledge*, London, 1963, p. 334.
 2. M. Cornforth, *Open Philosophy and Open Society*, Moscow, 1972, pp. 129-130 (Russian edition).

which may change with every new turn of history.¹

Being a major form of modern bourgeois philosophy, neo-positivism also exerts definite influence on the minds of people who do not belong to the class of the bourgeoisie, and even on the minds of some theoreticians and political leaders of the working-class movement. Right social reformism relies on the neo-positivist criticism of dialectics and counterpose to Marxism-Leninism their philosophy of evolution, of petty and purely quantitative reforms, of denying the contradictory nature of capitalism and the objective character of contradictions in general. They hold that the social partnership of employers and workers must gloss over the unnecessary and mistaken contradictions of capitalism. A typical document compiled by this trend of modern anti-dialectics of social reformism is the collections of articles entitled Critical Rationalism and Social Democracy, published in the Federal Republic of Germany in 1975-1978. In their articles the ideologists of the Right wing of the Social Democratic Party of Germany try to justify their rejection of the materialist dialectics of Marxism-Leninism with the help of Popper's philosophy.

Neo-Thomism

Another trend of the criticism of materialist dialectics is represented by the Neo-

Thomist philosophy of the Catholic Church. Already at the end of the 19th century the Vatican, the official centre of Catholicism, took the path of resolute struggle against Marxism and the revolutionary working-class movement. Having proclaimed the teaching of the medieval theologian Thomas Aquinas (1225-1275) the official Catholic philosophy, the Vatican urged the Christians to reject the atheistic theory of Marxism. One of the initial ideas of Thomism, i.e. the teaching of Thomas Aquinas, was the attempt conciliation of new scientific discoveries with the Catholic religious dogma. If science discovers new laws of nature, they should not of necessity contradict the Bible: by discovering new laws people

1. V.I. Lenin, Collected Works, Vol. 17, p. 39.

penetrate deeper into the original plan of divine creation and comprehend the laws which God used in devising his creations, in the world he created. Today, Neo-Thomism rejects without any reservations the dialectics of motion and development in nature and society.

The Neo-Thomist critique of dialectics is often referred to by the ideologists of many Christian parties which have become since 1945 the ruling or principal parties of the monopoly bourgeoisie in some capitalist countries of Western Europe and Latin America. The same arguments against Marxist philosophy are also advanced by some theorists of opportunism in the working-class movement. They regard any revolution, any leap in the development of nature or society as a disturbance of equilibrium, as a manifestation of the "ill-will" or erroneous decision-making, as disasters. At the same time such arguments must deny the basic, qualitative difference of the results of a leap, the results of a revolution from the original quality or state of nature and society.

Meanwhile the modern science has provided a brilliant confirmation and proof of the Marxist-Leninist understanding of the law of transformation of quantitative into qualitative changes as a universal objective law of development. The science of the origin of life on the Earth, developed by the Soviet biochemist N.A. Oparin, the science of the origin of man that relies on Engels's brilliant hypothesis which he expounded in his work The Part Played by Labour in the Transition from Ape to Man^L and the materialist teaching on the origin and essence of the human mind, especially the theory elaborated by the Soviet psychologist A.N. Leontiev, have shown the insolvency of all attempts made by Wetter and other Neo-Thomist philosophers to "refute" the dialectics of the transformation of quantitative into the qualitative changes, the role played by leaps and revolutions in the course of the objective development of nature and society. Of late a trend has appeared in bourgeois philosophy, which recognises the

1. Cf. F. Engels, Dialectics of Nature, pp. 170-183.

inevitable character of qualitative leaps in the development of scientific knowledge, the leaps being prepared by the accumulation of quantitative changes.

Existentialism

The third trend in modern bourgeois philosophy which strongly "criticises" materialist dialectics is existentialism, which appeared on the scene in the 1920s. One of its founders, the German philosopher Martin Heidegger (1898-1978), wrote in his book Being and Time (1926) that the existence, i.e. man's subjective self-awareness, is eternally and variably doomed to "exist" in the alienated forms of social consciousness imposed from outside. According to existentialism, this is the basis of the eternal contradiction between man and society, and no progress, no revolution can rid man of "alienation": the results of social activity have always been conceived by people in a different light, for they have proved to be inimical to human freedom. The French existentialist Jean-Paul Sartre (1905-1980) counterposed to the materialist dialectics of Marxism-Leninism his theory, which he expounded in his book Critique of Dialectical Reason (Paris, 1960). He accused Marxism of absolutising and idealising progressive development and pitted against materialist dialectics his treatment of human alienation as the only source of contradictory development.

Criticism of Frankfurt School

Echoing the ideas of existentialism, the social philosophy of the Frankfurt school

as represented by Herbert Marcuse (1898-1979) and Theodore W. Adorno (1903-1969) tried to evolve the ideology of the New Left movement which stirred up, in the 1960s, a part of the student youth and the intelligentsia in the USA, France, the FRG and some other capitalist countries. In his book Negative Dialectics (1966) Adorno rejected the law of the negation of negation, since it ostensibly divorces the new from the old to a small degree and transfers to the new all the "sins" of an old quality.

In his book One-Dimensional Man (1964), Herbert Marcuse urged the petty-bourgeois intelligentsia and the student

penetrate deeper into the original plan of divine creation and comprehend the laws which God used in devising his creations, in the world he created. Today, Neo-Thomism rejects without any reservations the dialectics of motion and development in nature and society.

The Neo-Thomist critique of dialectics is often referred to by the ideologists of many Christian parties which have become since 1945 the ruling or principal parties of the monopoly bourgeoisie in some capitalist countries of Western Europe and Latin America. The same arguments against Marxist philosophy are also advanced by some theorists of opportunism in the working-class movement. They regard any revolution, any leap in the development of nature or society as a disturbance of equilibrium, as a manifestation of the "ill-will" or erroneous decision-making, as disasters. At the same time such arguments must deny the basic, qualitative difference of the results of a leap, the results of a revolution from the original quality or state of nature and society.

Meanwhile the modern science has provided a brilliant confirmation and proof of the Marxist-Leninist understanding of the law of transformation of quantitative into qualitative changes as a universal objective law of development. The science of the origin of life on the Earth, developed by the Soviet biochemist N.A. Oparin, the science of the origin of man that relies on Engels's brilliant hypothesis which he expounded in his work The Part Played by Labour in the Transition from Ape to Man^I and the materialist teaching on the origin and essence of the human mind, especially the theory elaborated by the Soviet psychologist A.N. Leontiev, have shown the insolvency of all attempts made by Wetter and other Neo-Thomist philosophers to "refute" the dialectics of the transformation of quantitative into the qualitative changes, the role played by leaps and revolutions in the course of the objective development of nature and society. Of late a trend has appeared in bourgeois philosophy, which recognises the

1. Cf. F. Engels, Dialectics of Nature, pp. 170-183.

country and a given moment, the danger of dogmatism increases. And on the other hand, if one inflates national features, transient conditions and ignores or disregards the operation of general objective laws of development, then the inevitable possibility arises for revisionism. Both types of mistakes have been registered in certain cases by the Communists of some countries in recent decades. As for the ruling communist parties of socialist countries, they warned other parties of such danger in the Statement they adopted at the International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties held in Moscow in 1957.

The absolutisation or ignoring of both the universal and the particular, the singular equally contradicts the methodology of materialist dialectics and is bound to lead to mistakes and setbacks in struggle and to failures in guidance.

youth to demonstrate a "great refusal" from participating in the life of the "highly developed industrial society" and abstain from the organised class struggle together with, and under the leadership of, the working-class movement. According to him, the communist party and the trade union movement represent a kind of "alienation", the restricted freedom of the individual and the subordination of man to his "social role". From these positions the existentialists and the followers of the Frankfurt philosophical school also reject real socialism: these enemies of dialectics present the socialist state, public ownership of the basic means of production and the need for organised, planned and disciplined labour as "new forms of human alienation".

Thus, the neo-positivist revision of the law of the unity and conflict of opposites, the Neo-Thomist negation of the law of the transformation of quantitative into qualitative changes, the existentialist "critique" of the law of the negation of negation express the hostility of the reactionary classes and their ideologists to dialectics and also exert a pernicious influence on the opportunist elements in the working-class and revolutionary movement. A deep study and mastery of materialist dialectics arms revolutionaries and their parties in the struggle against reactionary forces and opportunism in their own ranks.

Certain mistakes committed by individual Communist and Workers' parties in their policy at various stages of their activity show that they achieve poor results because of the insufficient mastery of the method of materialist dialectics. This is due to the fact that non-dialectical views are epistemologically rooted in the contradictions of the process of cognition. As the world communist movement and the world socialist system grow and gather in strength, the conditions in which Communists struggle and work become more and more varied. In this context, of special importance for the Communists in all countries is the dialectics of the general laws of development and of the specific features of their operation and manifestation in every country at different development stages. If one absolutises the general laws of revolutionary struggle and underestimates the specifics of a given

The founders of Marxism-Leninism were invariably concerned with the question of knowledge in their theoretical works. The solution of these questions became most imperative at the turn of the 20th century following the revolution in physics and the crisis experienced by its methodological foundations. In his book Materialism and Empirio-Criticism Lenin provided the answers to the questions in the theory of knowledge, elaborated the fundamental propositions of the theory of knowledge in Marxist philosophy and gave a comprehensive treatment of the theory of knowledge as the theory of reflection.

The advantages of Marxist-Leninist epistemology are due to the socio-class basis of the Marxist-Leninist world outlook, and the unique practical function it fulfils in the struggle for remaking society and man himself.

The creative cognitive activity of the broad masses of working people led by the working class and its party gains momentum under socialism which makes it possible to combine the advantages of socialism with the achievements of the scientific and technological revolution.

The basic question of philosophy as treated in Marxist philosophy applies not to an individual aspect of interaction between consciousness and the external object but to the interaction between matter and consciousness in general.

Essence of Cognition

The point of departure of Marxist-Leninist epistemology is the principle that cognition

is part and parcel of people's aggregate activity aimed at remaking nature, society and human personality. Since this activity is socio-historical in its essence, then cognition which is its integral part is also social in nature. Marx, Engels and Lenin uphold this thesis in their struggle against all kinds of conceptions founded on the biased interpretation of the essence of the cognitive process. Pre-Marxian materialists sought the essence of the cognitive process in the influence exerted by objects of nature on man's sense organs. Though this influence is objective reality (we shall see later on that Marxist-Leninist epistemology takes this fact into account and explains it), it does not make the

Chapter III

THE DIALECTICS OF THE PROCESS OF COGNITION

Elaboration of the problems pertaining to cognition acquires today major importance since the objects of cognition now embrace such complex natural systems as the inner-atomic structure and the biosphere while social cognition is designed to study the contemporary capitalist and socialist societies. The specifics of human society as compared with any other self-contained material system lie in its mode of being. The essence of social phenomena cannot be cognised without the knowledge and application of the scientific methodology of cognition.

The revolutionary activity of the working class and its party proves most effective when it relies on the Marxist-Leninist theory of knowledge of the socio-historical process.

What is the essence of cognition? What are the main characteristics of the subject and object of cognition? What are the specifics of scientific cognition and its methods?

1. The Essence of Cognition. Object and Subject of Cognition

From time immemorial philosophy has tackled not only the question of what is the world in which man lives and acts like, but also of how man cognises this world. The ability of each man to cognise the surrounding world depends on the concrete social historical conditions of the period, general regularities in the process of cognition, the character and specific features of his cognitive activity, and on the interpersonal communication in the process of cognition, assimilation and dissemination of the acquired knowledge and objective truths.

Philosophy has long incorporated a special discipline -- the theory of knowledge which is also called epistemology (from Greek episteme -- knowledge).¹

¹ Sometimes the term "gnoseology" is also used (from Greek gnosis -- knowledge, and logos -- doctrine).

historical activity of past and present generations, the explanation it provides for the cognitive process promotes the growth of consciousness of the masses — the decisive force of a revolutionary remaking of society.

The understanding of cognition as a process which is socio-historical in its essence provides a theoretical basis for explaining its most important aspects and components.

Concept of Object of Cognition

During his vital activity man confronts various natural things, phenomena, and processes

which he strives to transform, utilise and comprehend. Man enters into diverse social relationships with other people and, naturally, strives to apprehend the essence of these relationships, their origins and mechanisms of their change. Finally, from time immemorial man strives to comprehend himself, and to ascertain the laws, mechanisms and principles of consciousness, thought and cognition.

Cognition, being inseparably linked with activity, is directed at the natural and social world surrounding people, and at their own inner world. Epistemology regards as the objects of cognition all the phenomena, processes and relationships coming within the range of human knowledge.

The objects of cognition are numerous and diverse, and undergo perpetual change. Despite the seemingly boundless diversity of the cognisable world, we may identify three basic types of the objects of cognition.

First, these are the things, phenomena and processes of nature, and nature in its unity and integrity. Within this type we should distinguish between the natural material environment proper, i.e. nature which has not yet been brought into the orbit of man's influence, and substances and objects of nature which have already entered the sphere of human activity and have been transformed by man.

The second type comprises diverse social relationships, processes and phenomena of social life, and integral social organisms, society as a whole, and the historical process of its development and transformation.

The third object of cognition is man himself, his origin, evolution in the surrounding reality, his inner world, con-

essence of the process of cognition. Quite the opposite, this fact and man's sensory activity as a whole cannot be scientifically substantiated unless we take into consideration the socio-historical nature and the active character of the interaction between man the knower and the surrounding reality. Marx wrote: "The chief defect of all hitherto existing materialism - that of Feuerbach included - is that the thing /Gegenstand/, reality, sensuousness, is conceived only in the form of the object /Objekt/ or of contemplation /Anschauung/, but not as human sensuous activity, practice, not subjectively."¹

Treating the dependence of the subject on the object as the absolute, pre-Marxian materialists arrived to the denial of man's active spiritual creativity. The point is not that Marxism recognises the connection of knowledge with practice. Materialists recognised this connection long before the appearance of Marx's theory. The main point here is how the essence of connection between knowledge and practice is interpreted. According to Marxism, man's practical and cognitive activities are interlinked and simultaneously do not coincide, being somewhat independent and possessing specific distinctions.

Idealists ignored, still more than pre-Marxian materialists, the connection of the cognitive process with practice, with the actual development of society and history. Alleging that cognition develops exclusively under the influence of spiritual stimuli, idealism is interested mainly in the intellectual form of activity dismissing the actual, sensory activity.

Providing a comprehensive treatment of cognition as a socio-historical process, Marxist-Leninist epistemology not only explains it theoretically but also fulfils a major practical function. Since Marxist epistemology regards cognition in its inseparable unity with the transforming socio-

1. K. Marx, "Theses on Feuerbach",
in: K. Marx and F. Engels, Selected Works in three volumes,
Vol. 1, p. 13.

By regarding nature as the object of cognition and activity, dialectical materialist epistemology refutes both idealism and metaphysical (i.e. anti-dialectical) materialism. It is also directed against agnosticism, i.e., against conceptions denying any possibility of cognising reality. Foreign Marxist-Leninist philosophers uphold this proposition in their struggle against idealist epistemologists and creatively apply it in their social research.

Repudiation of materialism and dialectics often leads to agnosticism, and to scepticism and subjectivism. It is not accidental that in the conceptions hostile to Marxism, for instance, propounded by existentialists, idealism leads to a pessimistic appraisal of prospects of human social activity, which in turn is closely linked with regarding nature as an alien and dangerous medium, inaccessible to man, within which dialectics is inapplicable (as claimed by the French philosopher Jean-Paul Sartre).

The bourgeois and revisionist conceptions of "cognitive pluralism" which have become widespread in recent years are based on the similar principle of a break-up of the interconnection between the objects of cognition belonging to single integral reality. In this case reality "falls" into "fragments" each of which allegedly can be cognised through a "unique" principle.

Marxist-Leninist epistemology treats the objects of cognition as the closely interlinked aspects of unified revolutionary transforming activity, embracing knowledge and alteration of the natural world, a revolutionary transformation of the social world, and changes man himself undergoes.

This, however, does not mean that the specific features of each type of the objects of cognition are ignored. On the contrary, Marxist-Leninist epistemology draws particular attention to the specifics of the human cognition of social phenomena, identifying them as the second type of the objects of cognition.

In cognising social relations two aspects should be taken into consideration. On the one hand, social relationships exist outside and independently of human consciousness, i.e., they are objectively "given" to an individual and a

sciousness, laws of cognitive activity and its results.

Whereas Marxist-Leninist philosophy as a whole reveals the most general laws of the development of nature, society and human thought, the theory of knowledge aims to disclose the laws and mechanisms regulating the cognition of these main spheres of reality. A differentiated study of the various types of cognisable objects is of prime importance for the revolutionary transforming activity, for nature, society and consciousness possess their own unique features. To influence and cognise them one should take into account the specific features of objects and phenomena pertaining to each of these spheres.

The material objects and processes of nature always precede the process of cognition and are "given" to the know-er. This was justly stressed by the pre-Marxian materialists. They, however, failed to see the connection of the material objects of cognition with the preceding and contemporary stages in man's practical transforming activity. Here lies the basic limitation of metaphysical materialism.

Man starts cognition and conquest of virgin nature by making use of the material of "second nature", i.e. the ob-jects he has created himself, instruments and means of labour, in particular. Therefore the real basis of knowledge is made up not of the material objects of nature proper but the material objects inseparably linked with man's practical transforming activity.

All pre-Marxian philosophies disregarded the objective practical activity aimed at the creation and alteration of material things. Hence the essential conclusion: pre-Marxian philosophers, both materialists and idealists, were unable to scientifically comprehend the unity of the process of cognition and practical activity, and, therefore, failed to understand the significance of material practical activity in society and in cognition.

Defining the fundamental distinction of Marxist episte-mology from all previous theories of knowledge, Lenin under-lined that it was Marx who had introduced practice into the theory of knowledge.

It should be borne in mind, however, that not all man's mental states are registered immediately in his consciousness at the given moment. Practical activity and everyday life do not always call for completely conscious forms of man's behaviour. Some actions which have taken shape in man's previous practice are performed somewhat automatically and in this sense "unconsciously." The problem of the unconscious has always been a subject of sharp controversy in philosophy. Some philosophical schools such as Freudianism and neo-Freudianism exaggerate and absolutise the role of the unconscious in human life. In the science of man the sphere of the unconscious, alongside the conscious actions and motivations, also becomes the object of scientific cognition and comprehension.

The revolutionary struggle of the proletariat today demands a differentiated approach to the groups and strata allying with the working class in its struggle for peace and social progress. An essential element of such an analysis is a circumstantial account of the processes taking place in human consciousness: dissatisfaction and protest, desires, demands and expectations which are incompatible with the capitalist social conditions. Such ideas and sentiments should be carefully considered and utilised, and be influenced in the spirit of Marxism-Leninism. This implies that the working people's thoughts, feelings, ideas, sentiments and expectations make a specific and essential object of cognition.

The idealised objects of cognition include not only the living actual consciousness, mental processes, but also the results of this activity which often exist independently of individuals and their consciousness. The result of human cognitive activity is knowledge expressed in the system of notions, ideas and conceptions. Knowledge accumulated by mankind in the course of social historical practice and in the form of certain information (expressed in words, concepts, skills and products of culture) handed down to subsequent generations becomes an indispensable precondition for the further cognitive and practical activity. The process of assimilating knowledge may be directly included in people's practical activity. Meanwhile with the deepening and enrich-

class as a prerequisite of their transforming activity. For this reason, while cognising and transforming social relationships we should take into account the objective regularities of their development, their independence of the human consciousness.

On the other hand, social phenomena in some way or another incorporate the results and forms of people's conscious activity; people's consciousness, will, actions, opinions, ideas and goals are embodied in them. Therefore, not only alteration and transformation but also the knowledge of social relationships are unthinkable without due account of the relevant changes in man's inner world, that is, the world of attitudes, goals, values and ideologies.

Hence another requisite of Marxist-Leninist epistemology: in social cognition of great importance is socio-historical and ideological position of those involved in cognition (individuals, parties, classes). In some cases this position promotes cognition presupposing a possibility and sometimes a necessity of the objective knowledge of social phenomena. In other cases the socio-historical position of classes, parties and individuals impedes or makes impossible profound, objective understanding of certain social phenomena and processes, which is characteristic of the reactionary parties and classes seeking to preserve the outdated social relationships.

In the process of social historical practice man considers his position in the world, his activity, and the state and content of his consciousness using the knowledge to control his behaviour. This is self-awareness, which means that the consciousness of an individual and that of the people surrounding him become the object of cognition. It also includes the content and orientation of consciousness of an individual, social groups, society as a whole, and the correlation of the various elements of consciousness such as sentiments, feelings, desires, opinions (also the ideas and conceptions explaining consciousness). The attitude of the individual, class and society to certain phenomena and processes occurring in objective reality also makes the object of cognition.

activity. Rejecting idealism which dismisses the natural biological characteristics of the subject of cognition, the dialectical-materialist theory of knowledge opposes the various forms of biologism, which sees the sole and decisive essence of cognition in the biological factors. Representing the highest product of natural evolution, consciousness, quite naturally, "agrees" with nature which has given birth to it: first, it obeys the most general laws like the rest of nature; second, it can, in principle, secure man's life, development and functioning in the natural environment. Here lies the general precondition for the unity of subject and object, thinking and being, man and nature, the understanding of which distinguishes materialist dialectics from all forms of idealism. Human activity knows neither the primacy of the biological factors nor the dualism of the natural and "purely human", man's natural and socio-historical characteristics. Man's "nature", his biological functions and needs are formed and considerably transformed under the impact of people's socio-historical activity.

Man as the subject of socio-historical process and, consequently, as the subject of cognition is, undoubtedly, a natural being which thinks and cognises with the aid of his brain, nervous system and sense organs. Man's brain, nervous system and sense organs have emerged and developed in the process of historical development, i.e., in the process of formation of man as a socio-historical being. Therefore, man's natural characteristics are inseparable from his socio-historical development.

The fact that the mechanisms regulating human activity and cognition are determined by socio-historical factors is particularly evident under the conditions of modern production, in the context of the scientific and technological revolution. People always make use of and transform the products which in crystallised form reflect the knowledge and experience of many human generations. Man "inherits" the material objects which represent either the result of labour, industrial activity of various generations or the unique products of culture and artistic activity. He inherits the language created and developed by many generations of people,

ment of cognition its products -- knowledge, information -- become themselves the object of cognition. Particular cognitive activity is consciously directed at a specific study of knowledge itself.

Knowledge is a special type of the idealised results of the development of human cognition, an outcome and precondition for the development of intellectual culture of mankind. Representing the result of some cognitive processes, knowledge then turns into a precondition, an object of man's subsequent practical and cognitive activity.

So far we have considered the interaction of subject and object in terms of the object of cognition. Now we must consider this unity and interconnection in terms of the subject of cognition, i.e., to study the specifics of man's activity, since it is man who acts as the subject of cognition.

The prime characteristic of the subject of cognition in Marxist-Leninist epistemology is simple and clear: the knower is a concrete, real man who lives and acts in the concrete historical conditions. The basic precondition for the materialist understanding of history and, consequently, for the teaching on socio-historical essence of the process of cognition "are men, not in any fantastic isolation and fixity, but in their actual, empirically perceptible process of development under definite conditions."¹ This thesis is highly important for refuting the religious mysticism and various forms of idealism according to which the "true" subject of cognition is either God, or the mystical "absolute spirit" or a certain abstract essence, having no concrete human needs, no social and individual attributes.

The subject of human cognition is man, Homo Sapiens. He is part of nature, the product of its evolution. The connection of man with nature is essential for the theory of knowledge. Marxist-Leninist epistemology, however, does not regard the biological, natural factors as decisive in man's cognitive

^{1.} K. Marx and F. Engels, "The German Ideology", in Collected Works, Vol. 5, Progress Publishers. Moscow. 1976. p. 37.

knowledge, and on the educational level of the broad masses of working people. The revolution in science and technology could not be realised through the efforts of researchers alone and activation of the process of cognition and application of scientific knowledge in all the spheres of life had become a nationwide task.

In summation, Marxist-Leninist epistemology regards the process of cognition as a process of interaction between people, incorporating their practical interaction with the object of cognition. The regularities of this process are studied by that branch of epistemology which, proceeding from the formerly established characteristics of the object and subject of cognition, traces the process of cognition proper.

2. The Process of Cognition and Practice

In its analysis of the dialectics of the process of cognition Marxist-Leninist epistemology first of all establishes and examines its point of departure, the source of cognitive activity. As has been mentioned earlier, the theory of knowledge of dialectical materialism rejects a contemplative interpretation of cognitive activity based on the assumption that the objects and processes of nature are "given" to man in isolation from his sense organs. This thesis is the premise of studying sensory cognition.

Sensory Cognition

Sensory cognition is the prime source of cognition. Stressing this aspect, Marxist-Len-

inist epistemology consistently follows the materialist line in philosophy: it ascertains that the immediate interaction of man and mankind with the surrounding reality is of fundamental import for the development of the process of cognition. At the same time the Marxist-Leninist theory of knowledge, unlike contemplative materialism, does not regard sensory cognition as an independent stage within which there "exist", in an isolated form, first sensations, then perceptions and representations, and only then -- "rational" means of cognition embodied in thought and its products. Actually, sensory cognition in the real process of man's vital activity is inseparably linked with practice, namely, with the formation

and other systems of signs and symbols related to language. In the course of cognitive and practical social activity its subjects -- individuals, classes and parties -- proceed from the preconditions created by the previous history and at the same time solve the new topical tasks advanced by their epoch from different positions.

The subject and his goals arising from the character of social relationships may in different ways influence the cognitive process and its results. Some goals stimulate man to create an idealised model which adequately reflects the object under study, others bar the true knowledge of its essence. This negative phenomenon is characteristic of the capitalist society. Marx wrote: "It was thenceforth no longer a question, whether this theorem or that was true, but whether it was useful to capital or harmful, expedient or inexpedient, politically dangerous or not. In place of disinterested inquirers, there were hired prize-fighters; in place of genuine scientific research, the bad conscience and the evil intent of apologetic."¹

In the periods of revolutionary transformations the social activeness of the masses heightens, which always promotes the awakening of their awareness, and the growth of their class consciousness and political maturity. During revolutionary upheavals the working masses have always been an active force capable of overthrowing an obsolete social system.

Under the scientific and technological revolution the process of cognition has some distinctions as compared with previous epochs.

First of all, we should stress the immediate interdependence of production process, social activity and a huge amount of know-how deliberately orientated to solve practical tasks. This, in turn, means that the successful performance of all involved in production (in socialist society the activity of each citizen) in the decisive measure depends on an active realisation of the cognitive process, acquisition of

^{1.} Karl Marx, Capital, Vol. I, Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1965, p. 15.

Dialectical materialism and subjective idealism diametrically differ in their interpretation of the significance of sensations. The materialist stresses the objectivity of the source of sensations and those connections of an object that find their expression in sensations; he deems it necessary to thoroughly investigate the complex dialectics of objective and subjective factors in the formation and functioning of sensations. The subjective idealist, on the contrary, absolutises the subjective nature of an image evoked by sensations, interpreting it as a one-sided dependence of sensations on the inner state of the subject.

Regarding sensations as the reflection of objective reality, Marxist-Leninist epistemology is equally incompatible with "naive idealism". Its adherents assume that sensations provide a mirror-like reflection of an object, free of subjective moments, thus indentifying image and object.

The dialectics of the interrelationship of the objective and the subjective discloses that the subjective nature of an image does not imply only the fact that it lies in the human consciousness. Subjective moments are inherent in the content of a sensory image. Since any object possesses a multitude of properties, our sense organs can reflect only a few of these properties, which means that the decisive factor here is the structure of man's sense organs determining which of the properties of objective reality are reflected in the sensations of a given man and which are not.

Sensations do not exist outside the integral imaginal reflection of a certain object. Though thanks to our sense organs we perceive the spatial form, colour, sound and smell, we simultaneously experience a sensory urge to synthesise our sensations, which turns them into a perception. The specific property of perception is as follows: due to perceptions an object is "given" to our consciousness in its integral objective form, i.e., in the form of objective entity, independent of consciousness.

The term perception defines the process of creating an integral image of the material object which is under direct observation. Perception is an active process involving some creative moments. Owing to the repeated operation of perceptive mecha-

and materialisation of goals, with thought and language. Sensory cognition, however, possesses some unique features which become particularly evident when it is compared with the processes occurring in the theoretical activity, with abstract thinking. This is, to use Lenin's words, "living contemplation" where a special role belongs to the constant, direct or mediated, contacts of cognising subjects with the material objects and phenomena, man's active influence on the surrounding material world with a purpose of its remaking. The interaction between objects of nature and man's sense organs constitutes an element, an aspect of this process, but this interaction is not to be divorced from man's practical activity and regarded as an independent process, as was the case with pre-Marxian materialism. Dialectical materialism overcomes the metaphysical interpretation of sensory cognition which is reduced to naturalism and biologism.

It should be borne in mind that the elements and mechanisms of sensory cognition identified by the dialectical-materialist epistemology do not exist in isolation from man's active sensory and practical activity which is socio-historical in its essence.

"The first premise of the theory of knowledge," Lenin wrote, "undoubtedly is that the sole source of our knowledge is sensation."¹ Sensation is the simple and prime element of sensory cognition and the human consciousness in general.

In his work Materialism and Empirio-Criticism Lenin, among many other characteristics, underlined the definition of a sensation as a subjective image of the objective world. An image means the idealised reflection in consciousness of the material object which exists outside it. Sensation, consequently, is the subjective, idealised image of an object since it reflects the influence exerted by the object through the "prism" of human consciousness. Sensation is subjective in form but objective in content, for it is a copy, a "photograph" of objectively existing objects and phenomena.

1. V.I. Lenin, "Materialism and Empirio-Criticism", Collected Works, Vol. 14, Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1977, p. 126.

"colonialism", "imperialism" and the like are always associated with definite images representations and emotions. The whole system of human communication and information (nowadays it is the mass media) functions by means of certain signs, symbols and images.

The forms of reflection based on sensory images in their entirety form the cardinal elements of cognition which gain a universal significance.

There is another essential element of human sensory perception, inherent in man alone. Man can visually imagine not only what he has seen himself. A major part of his sensory experience includes images derived from descriptions made by others.

This ability, characteristic of man alone, to assimilate and transfer the general human experience has become nearly boundless, which is clearly connected with the universal significance of language.

The role of language in cognition in general and in sensory cognition, in particular, is immense. Suffice it to say that a fully developed person whose sense organs come into contact with a certain material object has already mastered speech and, consequently, can operate with concepts which along with the forms of language result from the accumulation and generalisation of previous historical experience. "Every word (speech) already universalises",¹ wrote Lenin. This fact essentially influences the mechanism and results of sensory cognition determining the specifically human functioning of sense organs.

Every man, thanks to his ability to speak, in his daily life relies on the centuries-old experience in "processing" the sensory data obtained from his direct contacts with objects, phenomena and facts.

1. V.I. Lenin, "Conspectus of Hegel's Book Lectures on the History of Philosophy", Collected Works, Vol. 38, Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1972, p. 274.

nisms we are capable of retaining in our memory the integral image of an object which is not under immediate observation. In this case we deal with a much more complex form of sensory cognition which is called representation. Representations provide a possibility to discard accidental, non-basic features of an object and retain the essential and necessary ones.

Thus, the main elements of sensory cognition are sensations, perceptions and representations.

The word "feeling" has another meaning: it expresses such emotions (sentiments, experiences, passions) essential and typical of man as anger, fear, love and hatred, sympathy and dislike, pleasure and displeasure. Emotions are a complex form of human sensuality closely linked with practice, with human culture and education.

Emotions are an active expression of man's attitude to a certain phenomenon always comprising, in an open or disguised form, an element of appraisal and is linked with such notions as "good", "kind", "bad", "evil", "just" or "unjust", "beautiful" or "ugly", etc. In modern literature these notions are often termed values. The concepts of good and justice are characteristic not only of individuals but of whole historical epochs' reflecting the world outlook of social groups and classes.

Thus, sensations, perceptions, representations and emotions make up the elements and mechanisms of sensory activity and sensory cognition. It should be stressed once more that in the actual process of cognition they do not exist in isolation from one another with perceptions following sensations and so on. The actual sensory cognition intertwined with the practical transformation of the material world is a complex synthetic unity of the above-mentioned mechanisms of the imaginal reflection of reality which are inseparably connected at the same time with forms of thought activity.

The forms of reflection based on sensory images in all the spheres of people's life and activity are interlinked with man's overall orientation in his practical activity, including his socio-political activity. Such essential ideas as "homeland", "native country", "one's own class", "the poor", "the rich", "the workers", "the capitalists", "neo-

formulate the interconnections between concepts whose meaning is revealed in the course of prolonged socio-historical process of cognition. Judgements, in turn, are an element of inference. One example of inference: "The capitalist society is a society characterised by social, national and racial oppression. The USA is a capitalist country. Therefore, social, national and racial oppression is inherent in the USA." Such judgements and inference logically formulate the complex process of cognitive activity, with every man accumulating the cognitive experience of many generations. This is true not only of the above examples of judgement and inference but also of the simplest judgements and inferences used in everyday practice. To formulate such a judgement as "stone can be used in house construction" people had to repeatedly verify it in the process of their practical activity. For this reason Lenin, speaking of these forms of thought studied by logic (and called "logical forms"), stressed that man's practical activity thousands of millions of times led to the repetition of these forms, turning them into a kind of axiom. To form concepts, judgements and inferences one has to "single out" separate aspects of an integral object, and subject them to study. Concepts help to mentally reproduce an integral object. The results of sensory experience are not discarded in the process but brought into necessary inner accord with each other and with the idealised properties.

In summation, Marxist-Leninist epistemology thoroughly investigates the complex dialectics of interrelationships between the sensory and rational, logical, elements in the process of cognition. It reveals the means by which the basis contradiction of knowledge at each stage of human cognition is solved.

The dialectical-materialist theory of knowledge proceeds from the fact that the interacting sensory cognition and conceptual thinking are inseparable from man's practical activity being socio-historical in nature. It is this premise of the Marxist theory of knowledge that makes it essential for theoretical comprehension of the revolutionary activity of the proletariat and its party. Marxist-Leninist epistemology was the first to make a special and systematic study of

Rational and Sensory Cognition

Philosophy has long ago singled out "rational" (or "logical") forms and modes of cognition which include concepts expressed in language, and the application of concepts in making judgements and inferences, in presenting proofs, in working out theories, etc.

Concepts are the forms of cognition embodied in words and expressing the universal essential properties and relationships of objects and phenomena. Human cognition is impossible without concepts. Every man in each generation would have to describe, compare and express in words each concrete thing, fact or phenomenon anew unless such generalised forms of thought have not been elaborated in the course of protracted historical process of human cognition. Operating with concepts, we in a concentrated form accumulate and make use of the knowledge attained by the centuries-long practical experience of mankind.

Human concepts result from the historical experience of certain communities of people, classes and social groups. Assimilation by an individual or a human generation of the established concepts and the role these concepts play in their consciousness and activity actually depend on all direct contacts of people with objective reality. In the course of these contacts concepts and ideas are repeatedly and comprehensively verified, with their content being enriched and, if necessary, filled out with a new meaning. Moreover, concepts acquire their actual meaning when the possibility of their practical application is apprehended by people. Concepts are inseparable from the complex process of the sensory practical activity of many generations. It is through the constant comparison with concrete objects, phenomena and relationships, and with their regularities that concepts acquire the objective significance for great numbers of people.

Concepts are used, as a rule, within the framework of a rational (logical) form - Judgement. For instance, the concept of "imperialism" in Marxist philosophy appears in such judgements as "imperialism is the last stage of capitalism, the eve of socialist revolution". Judgements express and

indispensable for understanding the interrelationships of subject and object, and the process of cognition. It is on this theoretical premise that Marx, Engels and Lenin introduced the criterion of practice into the theory of knowledge.

The theoretical and methodological provision of the Marxist teaching of practice underlie practically every branch of the theory of knowledge.

A special role in epistemology belongs to the unity of theory and practice, the latter regarded as the basis of knowledge and the criterion of truth in relation to theoretical cognition.

Theoretical Activity

In the process of historical development a special type of activity takes

shape which is aimed at the formation and change of knowledge, i.e., formation and change of concepts, ideas and theories. Consequently, in the process of the social division of labour there appears a special type of activity which is ultimately designed to practically utilise and alter the material world, nature and society, but its main and immediate task is to produce theoretical knowledge (as well as to store, accumulate, transfer and disseminate knowledge, and teach it). This is the activity designated to produce general concepts, ideas and principles and organised in society into a specific process. Marx calls this process intellectual production implying the special functions of certain groups of people to produce and assimilate the systems of scientific knowledge, to work out various theoretical and ideological, ethical and aesthetic conceptions, and to create works of literature and art.

Within the intellectual production a special place belongs to fundamental, theoretical research in science.

The attention Marxist philosophy pays to the specific problems involved in theoretical activity is primarily explained by the task Marxism-Leninism set before itself, that is, to turn socialism from utopia into a scientific theory and to combine the revolutionary practice of the masses with revolutionary theory. Substantiation of the unity of theory and

the connection between knowledge and practice.

The Concept of Practice

The concept of "practice" is of major importance in Marxist-Leninist philosophy.

In the general philosophical sense "practice" means the totality of various forms of man's sensory objective activity designed to transform the external matter al world — nature and society. "Practical activity" in this sense includes first of all the material production activity. Another essential form of practice is the revolutionary activity aimed at a radical change of society, at the actual transformation of social relationships and the individual. Among the forms of "global practice" are the struggle between the two world systems -- socialism and capitalism, and the world revolutionary process.

The meaning of the concept of "practice" ("practical activity") is more graphically revealed when compared with the concept of "theory" ("theoretical activity") which implies the intellectual cognitive activity as a whole. "Practice" ("practical activity") is directed at the actual natural and social world surrounding man and aimed at transforming it, whereas "theory" ("theoretical activity") has to deal with the idealised objects, that is, knowledge, theorifies, ideas and conceptions. It is in this sense that Marxism proclaims its thesis on the unity of theory and practice.

The criterion of the practice to be introduced into the theory of knowledge presupposes the unity of a number of aspects.

As Lenin stressed, human practice is the key point in the Marxist theory. The problem of practice is formulated and solved at various "levels" of the Marxist theory: primarily, within the framework of historical materialism (in its doctrine of production, the significance of material activity and material relationships, in its theory of revolutionary practice, etc.); within the philosophical teaching of man, his essence, the import of labour in personality formation and development; and in the dialectical-materialist conception of the essence of human activity. The dialectical materialist theory of knowledge proceeds from these ideas and concepts to draw concrete theoretical and methodological conclusions.

and its striving to conquer nature, as the idealists asserted.

Thus, within this division into "theory" and practice" the concept of "theory" embraces the results and precondition of an extensive range of intellectual activity: ideological systems, scientific conceptions, concepts and methods taken in their entirety. Epistemology, since it is specifically concerned with scientific knowledge alone, sometimes treats the concept of "theory" in a much narrower sense. In this case "theory" and "theoretical activity" are distinguished from the level of scientific knowledge which is called empirical scientific knowledge, the latter being contrasted to theoretical scientific knowledge proper. Theoretical knowledge combines concepts and formulas into a more or less integral argumentative scientific conception which formulates the laws of a rather wide field of reality. Both levels in scientific knowledge, particularly in best developed branches of science, are in principle, and tend to be, closely interconnected, with the experiment, the basis of empirical cognition, approximating practice and applied knowledge needed for production.

Unity of Theory and Practice

Marxist-Leninist philosophy, introducing the concept of practice into the theory of knowledge, regards it

as the basis of knowledge and the criterion of truth.

To treat practice as the basis of knowledge means, first of all, to believe that the historically specific activity (including research activity) emerged on the basis and thanks to the activity aimed at the practical exploration of the surrounding world, i.e., thanks to the material production and the revolutionary transforming practice. Practice is the basis of knowledge, for it is the practical requirements of social being that pose cognitive problems, stimulate the appearance of specialised intellectual activity, and then in the course of the latter's development "challenge" the intellectual production (including science). Revolutionary upheavals and shifts in historical practice, in the material activity and social relationships have always provided the

practice and understanding of its objective character provide a theoretical basis for comprehending a possibility of an alliance between the proletariat engaged in the sphere of actual production activity and those strata of the working people (including the progressive intelligentsia) who are engaged in theoretical activity.

During the revolution in science and technology the solution of the problem of correlation between theory and practice, in this case of its epistemological aspect, acquires special significance, both practical and theoretical. Control over the development of "theory" (in the fields of ideology, politics, scientific knowledge) should involve the whole of society. Moreover, under socialism it is possible and necessary to control this process on a planned, scientific basis. The unity of "theory" and "practice" in the epoch of the scientific and technological revolution is therefore much closer and many-sided than in previous historical periods. This unity, however, is based on distinguishing between theory and practice. Today, as never before, we should have an accurate and comprehensive understanding of the specifics involved in "theory", theoretical activity, particularly in scientific research. On its part, epistemology studies the cognitive aspects of this activity.

The specifics of theoretical activity are determined by its function of producing specialised knowledge. This activity is designed to obtain new objective, argumentative and verified knowledge of the essential law-governed relationships of investigated objects, phenomena and processes. The purpose of science and theoretical activity is to obtain new true knowledge, and to constantly verify the formerly attained scientific truths and include them into the new systems of theoretical explanation.

The appearance of theoretical activity and the emergence of ever new fields within its domain testify to the existence of serious, still unresolved problems in practical activity, in social development and cognition. It was under the impact of the requirements of production and social development that various scientific disciplines took shape, and not only of the inner requirements of the self-developing spirit

tion and application of truths are of vital importance for an activation of the revolutionary process and the masses' purposeful activity.

Marx, Engels and Lenin in their theory of truth proceed from the basic premise of materialist philosophy as a whole: the prime and essential precondition of the objectivity of truth is the existence of reality and its laws outside and independently of the consciousness of the knower. The concept of "objective truth" first of all denotes the special outcome of the dialectical interaction between subject and object, a reality independent of man and his cognitive activity.

Defining the objective truth, Lenin poses the question along the above lines: "Is there such a thing as objective truth, that is, can human ideas have a content that does not depend on a subject, that does not depend either on a human being or on humanity?"¹

One often comes across wrong interpretations or open distortions of this definition which is of fundamental import in the Marxist-Leninist theory. Thus, neo-Thomist critics of dialectical materialism promptly claim that Lenin's definition "follows" the spirit of religious philosophy which also asserts that truth does not depend either on the individual or on mankind as a whole. Indeed, neo-Thomists reject subjective idealism and recognise a definite role of sensory cognition and the fact that sensations are the images of things. But they see the object of rational cognition as the general, acting as an essence which can be known only by the intellect and which is ultimately a product of the spirit. Thus, they divorce sensory cognition from rational cognition, regarding the particular as the sensorially perceived world and the general as the supersensory, intellectual world. So, neo-Thomists refuse to acknowledge that Lenin defines truth primarily as the content of human ideas. There is no such thing as "superrational truth", any such interpretation inevitably leads to the idealist and religious mysticism. To

1. V.I. Lenin, "Materialism and Empirio-Criticism", Collected Works, Vol. 14, p. 122.

more powerful impetus to the development of sciences and all the branches of intellectual production.

As the basis of knowledge and in this sense a vehicle of the development of science (and the development of the intellectual production as a whole), practice thereby presents a natural "experimental base", a "trial ground" for testing, verifying and transforming a vast amount of data obtained by the specialised intellectual activity. Since practice is the point of departure in, and a stimulus to, the development of human cognition in general and theoretical cognition, in particular, epistemology regards it as the basis of knowledge. Practice is ultimately the universal decisive criterion of the truth of obtained knowledge. In this sense it is a testing stage of any true knowledge. To comprehend this aspect of practice we should ascertain how Marxist-Leninist epistemology treats the problem of truth.

The leninist understanding of truth as a process is linked with the dialectics of subject and object. The problem of truth, according to Lenin, is a problem of dialectical logic.

Cognition goes beyond the confines of the sensory content each time the reality is reproduced through the socially meaningful image, i.e., in the system of language, logical categories, etc.

Theory of
Truth

Truth is one of the most important elements in human culture. What are the specifics of truth?

Truth is the knowledge which corresponds to the essential connections and regularities of objective reality. Due to the process of its obtaining, clarifying and utilising, true knowledge is inseparably linked with the social historical practice, and with the process of cognition which is social in nature.

Under the scientific and technological revolution, the conversion of science into a direct productive force, and intensive application of objective knowledge in all spheres of man's vital activity the problem of truth, ever of great practical significance, becomes increasingly topical. Acquisi-

on. This is, to use Engels' words, "...the contradiction between man's inherently unlimited capacity for knowledge and its actual presence only in men who are externally limited and possess limited cognition..."¹ This contradiction is not only soluble in principle but it is actually solved in the course of human history.

Lenin subjected to criticism philosophical relativism basing himself methodologically on the theory of the absolute and relative character of true knowledge. The concept of "absolute truth", as seen by Marxism-Leninism, has the following content: recognition of "man's inherently unlimited capacity for knowledge" and the perpetual, ascending movement of mankind to new truths which, combined with the previously accumulated knowledge, immeasurably expand the horizon of the cognisable environment. Lenin stresses that "for dialectical materialism there is no impassable boundary between relative and absolute truth."²

The understanding of the dialectics of the cognitive process allows to ascertain the role of error in it. Scientific theory provides a reflection of the reality that is essentially but not completely true. Even in the most ideal case it is limited at least by the level of its own development. Therefore, the reflection of the reality in concepts and representations is also a distortion which is, admittedly, overcome by the subsequent development of knowledge, remaining at the same time relative at any given moment. "We cannot", wrote Lenin, "imagine, express, measure, depict movement, without interrupting continuity, without simplifying, coarsening, dismembering, strangling that which is living. The representation of movement by means of thought always makes coarse, kills, — and not only by means of thought, but also by sense-perception, and not only movement, but every concept."³ The dialectics of the process of cognition is very

1. F. Engels, Anti-Dühring, Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1975, p. 145.

2. V.I. Lenin, "Materialism and Empirio-Criticism", Collected Works, Vol. 14, p. 136.

3. V.I. Lenin, "Conspectus of Hegel's Book Lectures on the History of Philosophy", Collected Works, Vol. 38, pp. 259-260.

assume such a definition of truth means to flagrantly contradict science whose purpose is to attain the true knowledge in its most systematised form.

The objectivity of truth, i.e., independence of its content of man and mankind in the Marxist-Leninist understanding does not isolate it from human activity but, conversely, presupposes its comprehensive interpretation as a process which is socio-historical and dialectical in nature.

Disclosing the dialectics of the cognitive process, Lenin formulates the following question: "... can human ideas, which give expression to objective truth, express it all at one time, as a whole, unconditionally, absolutely, or only approximately, relatively?"¹ Materialist dialectics gives the following answer: "...this is not a simple, not an immediate, not a complete reflection, but the process of a series of abstractions, the formation and development of concepts, laws, etc., and these concepts, laws, etc... embrace conditionally, approximately, the universal law-governed character of eternally moving and developing nature."² The problem of objective truth is actually solved through the concept of relative truth.

The objective truth acts in the form of relative truth, which means that any objective knowledge of any field of reality available at a given moment is not to be considered as complete and exhaustive but as relative knowledge. At the same time, the content of relative truth is still independent of man and mankind, i.e., it remains objective truth. The human process of progress to the objective knowledge depends on the vital activity of the actually existing subject, an individual, on the position of classes and groups and on the specific historical conditions.

Marxism-Leninism, unlike bourgeois philosophy, regards this fact as a living and real contradiction of human cogniti-

1. V.I. Lenin, "Materialism and Empirio-Criticism", Collected Works, Vol.14, p. 122.

2. V.I. Lenin, "Conспектus of Hegel's Book The Science of Logic", Collected Works, Vol. 38, p. 182.

becomes particularly relevant in the context of the revolution in science and technology. Modern production daily proves in practice the actual effectiveness of scientific achievements, their "objective truth", and outlines the yet unresolved problems. The production and utilisation of new synthetic materials, for instance, authentically prove the truth of the relevant chemical knowledge.

The above is also true of the interaction between social science and social political practice, namely, between the Marxist-Leninist theory and the practice of revolutionary struggle for socialism.

However, not only the scientific theory should develop in such a way as to make possible its practical application and verification therewith, but practice itself should raise to a higher level to become a tangible criterion of the truth of theories advanced by science. Thus, the revolutionary activity of the working people, resting on the conclusions and fundamental propositions of the revolutionary theory, should be mass-scale, consistent and effective to be regarded as a real and basic criterion of the truth of this theory and the source of its further creative development.

"Practice is higher than (theoretical) knowledge, for it has not only the dignity of universality, but also of immediate actuality",¹ wrote Lenin.

Stressing that the standpoint of real life and practice should be the prime and basic standpoint in the theory of knowledge, Lenin warned against the certain relativity of the criterion of practice. He pointed out that practice itself, the practice of the proletariat's class struggle, for instance, is a constantly developing and contradictory historical process depending on the objective conditions of place and time, on the actual correlation of opposing social forces, on the concrete characteristics of its participants and leaders, etc.

This process does not merely follow a theory as if it was its "embodiment" and practical realisation but is

1. V.I. Lenin, "Conspectus of Hegel's Book The Science of Logic", Collected Works, Vol. 38, p. 213.

complex and does not, therefore, exclude a possibility of error from any cognitive act, including that of policy-making. Errors are inevitable in any process of cognition but they should be avoided, fought and overcome. Dialectical materialism believes that any error in the long run can be overcome, for if nothing can guarantee a researcher against errors then nothing can prevent him from overcoming them. "Human knowledge," wrote Lenin, "is not (or does not follow) a straight line, but a curve, which endless approximates a series of circles a spiral."¹

The concept of "absolute truth" underlines the connection of knowledge, including scientific knowledge, with the entire socio-historical process of practice. Theoretical cognition proceeds from the needs arising from the actual process of man's vital activity and ultimately comes back to it, meeting the demands of practice and verifying in it the accumulated knowledge. "From living perception to abstract thought, and from this to practice, -- such is the dialectical path of the cognition of truth, of the cognition of objective reality,"² wrote Lenin.

Representing a testing stage in relation to theoretical cognition, practice is regarded by Marxist-Leninist epistemology as the criterion of truth.

Practice as the Criterion of Truth

and expressed by Marx in his Theses on Feuerbach: "The question whether objective truth can be attributed to human thinking is not a question of theory but is a practical question. Man must prove the truth, i.e., the reality and power, the this worldliness of his thinking in practice."³ This

Here we find the graphic manifestation of the fact characterising the entire course of human cognition

1. V.I. Lenin, "On the Question of Dialectics", Collected Works, Vol. 38, p. 363.

2. V.I. Lenin "Conspectus of Hegel's Book The Science of Logic", Collected Works, Vol. 38, p. 171.

3. K. Marx, "Theses on Feuerbach", K.Marx, F.Engels, Collected Works, Vol. 5, p. 3.

provides a comprehensive answer to the question of the unity of theory and practice which, as has already been pointed out, is of fundamental importance for the revolutionary transforming activity of the working people. The principle of the organic connection between revolutionary practice and scientific theory is particularly evident in Marxist ideology.

Partisanship and Scientificity

Partisanship of Marxist-Leninist ideology is the most essential aspect of its connection with

the proletariat's revolutionary transforming practice, which means that in working out their social theory Marx, Engels and Lenin proceeded directly from the interests of the working class and all working people, and from the goals of communist and workers' parties. However, it would be entirely wrong to assume that to substantiate these interests and goals any assertions and subjective views of individual theoreticians will do. Marxist-Leninist ideology is opposed to those bourgeois authors who divorce ideology from science and claim that the principle underlying the formation of ideologies is always one and the same: there are as many ideological positions equally true as class or group interests. On these grounds, some modern bourgeois theorists, blame Marxism of the lack of "plurality", and of its "too rigid" criteria, asserting that in the sphere of ideology and social theory only "pluralist" approach is possible, monism being excluded in principle. This conception has always been widespread in the bourgeois ideology: it was shared by the leaders of pragmatism, by Karl Mannheim and Max Scheler, representatives of the sociology of knowledge, and nowadays it is shared by many "neo-Marxists".

Marxist-Leninist epistemology by no means denies that the process of cognition realised by individuals, classes and parties, under constantly changing socio-historical conditions, is in each case specific, and even unique. The roads of progress to the truth, consequently, may be multiple, and in this sense "plural". The specifics of human cognition, however, lie in the fact that the subject of cognition, moving in different ways, can come to one and the same universally relevant results. Objective truth owes its power in human

engendered by the actual social contradictions. This process is a dialectical combination of organisation, theoretical comprehension and spontaneity. The practice of the masses' class struggle, assuming the most varied forms, necessarily implies relatively independent cognitive activity of the masses themselves, not always directly linked with the existing theory. This activity embodies and sums up the experience of the masses, the experience of individual segments of the revolutionary movement which often confront not only phenomena envisaged on the whole by the theory, but also find themselves involved in unprecedented situation and developments not covered by it. The practice of the working people's class struggle sets a great number of problems which are yet to become the object of theoretical cognition.

Human practice is the living, developing process and provides, according to Lenin, an objective criterion of truth. However, at any given moment, in each concrete historical situation, Lenin warned, "the criterion of practice can never, in the nature of things, either confirm or refute any human idea completely. This criterion too is sufficiently 'indefinite' not to allow human knowledge to become 'absolute', but at the same time it is sufficiently definite to wage a ruthless fight on all varieties of idealism and agnosticism".¹

Practice is not the sum total of isolated actions of separate individuals, groups and organisations, divorced from the historical context, but the aggregate of world practice as a whole. "...The criterion of practice, i.e., the course of development of all capitalist countries in the last few decades, proves only the objective truth of Marx's whole social and economic theory in general, and not merely of one or other of its parts, formulations, etc... ."² The criterion of practice finds its fullest realisation in the forms of labour and socio-political activity, in those recurrent historical forms of exploration and alteration of natural and social being which express its basic laws. The theory of practice as the basis of knowledge and the criterion of truth

1. V.I. Lenin, "Materialism and Empirio-Criticism", Collected Works, Vol. 14, pp. 142-43.

2. Ibid., p. 143.

In ancient India, for instance, the materialist philosophical school Nyaya was engaged in the study of sources, objects and methods of cognition.

In the 16th-17th centuries, with the emergence of experimental natural science, methods of cognition were a subject of study of philosophers and scientists alike. In the 19th-20th centuries the problem of method in research and the methodology of science held a special place in the theoretical activity of philosophers and natural scientists. Methods of cognition and their efficiency may be identified with the strategy of research, for, according to Marxist-Leninist philosophy, method is a theoretical reflection of certain regularities and basic properties of objective reality or, to use Engels' definition, an analogue of reality.¹ Therefore, the wider the scope of operation of laws the more general are the methods by which they are investigated. Materialist dialectics is the universal method of cognition.

In research it is very important to master the principles of dialectical method to clearly see that the process of scientific cognition obeys the complex dialectical laws of development and change and accumulates new facts and contradictions which call for new theoretical conceptions. Dialectics as a doctrine of the universal method of cognition is concretised in the research into special methods fruitfully applied in scientific cognition. In the framework of methodology, or the logics of scientific research method is the aggregate of rules and recommendations pertaining to the course of scientific cognition and consciously applied by scientists in accordance with research targets.

We have every reason to believe that there exists a group of general methods applied in all sciences. They have inner distinctions determined by a level of scientific knowledge and the tasks solved by a given discipline or a given theory. Among the general scientific methods may be found both methods of empirical research and methods applied in theoretical con-

1. See F. Engels, *Dialectics of Nature*, Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1979, p. 43.

cognition to its universality. To treat its content "pluralistically" means to make the very concept of truth insipid. This is equally valid for the cognition of nature and laws of social development. The laws and formulas of physics and mathematics cannot be treated "pluralistically", in accordance with someone's subjective, arbitrary will; likewise, regularities of social development discovered by the social studies are not "plural". If they are reflected objectively, i.e., truly, they must become in future the single basis of knowledge and action.

Marxist-Leninist ideology and the Marxist-Leninist social theory are based on this epistemological principle.

The epistemological analysis of the specifics inherent in theoretical activity finds its further realisation in the Marxist-Leninist theory of the methods of scientific cognition.

3. The Methods of Scientific Cognition

Scientific knowledge is always consistent and systematic in character. Long before the appearance of scientific knowledge people acquired valuable data on the properties inherent in natural and social phenomena. This testifies to the fact that scientific and ordinary knowledge are not absolutely barred from each other and that both types of knowledge strive to attain objective truth. Scientific knowledge, however, is not the sum total or a direct continuation of ordinary ideas obtained through common sense but a logically organised conceptual reflection of the essence, natural laws, and fundamental properties of objective reality. It is thanks to its ability to systematise, substantiate and be controlled that scientific knowledge is characterised by a high level of authenticity.

Methods of Theoretical
and Empirical Research

In acquisition and formation of scientific knowledge methods of research play an immense role.

This is not accidental. At the dawn of ancient civilisations philosophers were also concerned with the problems of cognition, of acquiring knowledge.

mechanics and in some other fields of physics. This method is based on the following principle: a number of theoretical propositions are selected that in a given context need no proof (axioms) and further propositions (theorems) are then deduced from them according to the rules of logic. The method of deducing conclusions from the accepted general theoretical premises (in this case -- from the axioms) is called the deductive method. The content of a theory depends on the initial axioms. In mathematics they may be different and even diametrically opposed. Thus, Euclid and Lobachevsky proceeded from the various axioms and created two systems of geometry each of which has great theoretical significance and is directly or indirectly applied in science and technology.

Each discipline, including theoretical studies, has its own division of labour based on the tasks solved by researchers. Some of them provide a theoretical substantiation of scientific facts, others deal with certain particular elements of a theory, still others set out to produce a systematised general theory which will embrace all the essential regularities governing a given range of phenomena. In each of these three cases different methods are applied. Marx solved the task of the third type when in his Capital he created a theoretical system of the political economy of capitalism. It was Marx's outstanding achievement that he thoroughly elaborated on the methods relevant to the task (the method of proceeding from the abstract to the concrete, the unity of the logical and the historical, etc.).

Despite the distinction between theoretical and empirical research, they represent interconnected stages in the process of scientific cognition and, consequently, they may solve similar tasks arising at both levels and determined by the specifics of research cognitive activity. Hence the application of some methods, with a certain differentiation, in both empirical and theoretical research.

Such are, for instance, methods applied in analysis and synthesis. Analysis is the break-up of investigated objects into the constituent elements or into various types of relationships, each to be subjected to a special study. Synthesis is the subsequent combining of the elements, thus singled out

structions.

Methods of empirical research depend in a great measure on its function and designation: at the empirical level of cognition man singles out, in the diverse environment surrounding him, the "objects" to be studied by science. These objects are investigated, observed, classified and subjected to certain goal-oriented influences exerted in a special process of observation or in the experiment. It is clear that not only physical processes (which do not exist in isolated form) occur inside physical devices, both small and large-sized. But experimental physicists apply special devices and methods which allow to observe those processes and phenomena which they are concerned with. "The physicist," wrote Marx, "either observes physical phenomena where they occur in their most typical form and most free from disturbing influence, or, wherever possible, he makes experiments under conditions that assure the occurrence of the phenomenon in its normality."¹ Precise methods are elaborated for operating devices and processing their readings, and so on. Methods of experimental observation are applied and improved, which are by no means an end-in-itself but designed to disclose the physical, chemical, biological and other regularities of the natural world.

With some reservations and specifications the same is valid for the social sciences which also operate with facts, process observation data and conduct social experiments.

Empirical observations in science are generalised by the method of scientific induction, i.e., a special inference which allows to advance from the characteristic of investigated facts to the formulation of general empirical principles or regularities, extending them over a wide range of objects.

Since the process of scientific cognition at the theoretical level clearly differs from that at the empirical level, it also has its own special methods, one of which is the axiomatic method, long and widely applied in mathematics, in

1. Karl Marx, Capital, Vol. I, p. 8.

Man and the Lower Animals

ARISTOTLE'S views of physiology and zoology are to be found in several important treatises, among which the *de Partibus Animalium* and *de Generatione Animalium* are outstanding. I shall describe these treatises more fully later in this chapter, and at the same time consider questions relative to their systematic arrangement and chronological order. Provisionally I shall make what appears to be a safe assumption, viz. that the *de Anima* is intended to precede these biological treatises and is itself a coherent whole, not a patchwork. If this is so, Aristotle's whole work in this branch of science is founded on his view of the soul as the entelechy of the body.

His view of nature has three notable features, of which something has already been seen. *Firstly*, he arranges all living beings in a scale, according to the complexity of the psychical faculties they display, placing man towards the top of this scale; and this idealistic, and perhaps fanciful, view to some extent impedes any attempt at a sober classification of animals. *Secondly*, his interpretation of all natural processes is frankly teleological; the physical scientist must in his view aim at the discovery and statement of the *final cause*, as well as the efficient cause and material condition. This mode of explanation is, for obvious reasons, even more prominent in Aristotle's account of living things, their organs, instincts and mode of life, than it was in his astronomy and physics. *Thirdly*, he is what would now be called a vitalist. There is for him a clear division between the movement and qualitative change of lifeless bodies and the processes which appear first in living and growing things, and, though he does not seem to argue at length

and studied, into a unified entity to be regarded then as a specific object of scientific research. In Capital Marx analytically singles out use value and exchange value of the commodity, and then synthesises them, introducing the new theoretical concept of "value".

Among methods applied both at the empirical and theoretical levels are quantitative methods and methods of logical analysis. Modern natural and some social sciences make wide use of mathematical and logical languages. Various disciplines use mainly a certain body of mathematics. Wide-scale application of mathematical methods in sciences, or their mathematisation, as it is now called is a process based on the universal nature of quantitative regularities. All objects and processes possess quantitative characteristics. Expressing this idea, Galileo remarked that the book of nature is written in the language of mathematics.

The quantitative methods include probability-statistical methods, applied both in the natural and social sciences to investigate objects whose accurate calculation is unattainable. Thus, in relation to certain systems possessing, as scientists say, a great number of "degrees of freedom", it is possible to make only probable computations and establish relevant laws which are called statistical laws. Similar situations arise in various sciences: molecular physics, chemistry, genetics, and so on. Since the 19th century probability-statistical methods have been widely applied in social sciences: demography, social statistics and sociology. It is a noteworthy fact that these methods began to be applied in natural sciences after they had been tested in social statistics.

The tasks solved in the social sciences by means of probability-statistical methods are most diverse. They have to do with the processing of statistical data of mass-scale character, such as the population of a country and its estimated requirements, economic indicators, public opinion polls, and the like. The most important methodological problem arising therewith, which is of great political and ideological significance for the social sciences, lies in the necessity to combine mathematical methods with the scientifically-sub-

stantiated theoretical provisions. Otherwise, mathematics might be abused (as evidenced by modern Western sociology and social statistics) with a purpose to "prove" deliberately falsified facts and raise to the status of "law" such phenomena which are accidental in character and need a profound scientific study.

The same refers to a wealth of methods of scientific cognition as a whole. Application of methods is not an end-in-itself. Methods by themselves cannot guarantee the success of scientific research. Once mastered, they enrich scientific inquiry and make it conscious and purposeful, provided a researcher can apply them to cognise the object, disclose the actual regularities which characterise it and exist outside the human consciousness, and to ascertain their dialectical character. This means that the scientist should master not only special and particular research methods but also the dialectical-materialist philosophy and its theory of knowledge.

Cognition and Revolutionary Practice

The study of the specifics of scientific cognition and its methods is of special importance for the working class and

its party. First, it helps to understand the specifics of research work which, in the context of the scientific and technological revolution and consolidation of the alliance of the working class and peasantry with the working intelligentsia, is an essential aspect of the theoretical and practical political work of communist parties. Second, today the working class and its party are in the vanguard of social research, which means that not only ideologists and theoreticians of the party but also the party as a whole, and, in the long run, the whole working class should be aware of the specifics underlying social research.

This also elucidates a more general significance of the study by revolutionaries of Marxist-Leninist epistemology which, by disclosing the inner regularities governing human cognition, shows that the progress of knowledge is inseparable from social transformations.

For this reason freedom to the extent that it is connect-

ed with knowledge, is defined in Marxist-Leninist philosophy as a cognised necessity. In this sense man's activity is free if it is based on his knowledge of objective regularities characterising nature, society and man himself. Freedom is the ability to make decisions as regards goals and means of action - "knowledgeably". Certainly, a measure of freedom depends not only on successes scored in people's cognitive activity but also on their practical activity, organisation of their conscious life, and on the essence and content of their social being. Suffice it to mention that within various social systems the progress of science and scientific knowledge may have diametrically different consequences and may be used by various social classes and forces in their interests. In socialist society scientific knowledge is necessary for a planned and accurate management of society, its improvement and for building communist social relations with the most active and conscious participation of the broad masses. In capitalist society scientific achievements are used by the ruling classes and groups for intensification of exploitation and preservation and consolidation of the class privileges.

Revolutionary forces in the capitalist world cannot achieve man's national and social emancipation without profound knowledge, without scientific theory and its further development, i.e., without the unity of revolutionary scientific theory and the practice of liberation movement. And in this respect the success of the revolutionary movement and winning of freedom depend on the revolutionaries' awareness and on their efficiency in applying achievements of the advanced theoretical research and developing it.

The Marxist-Leninist theory of knowledge links cognition with the objective laws of nature and society and, at the same time, reveals the preconditions for people's revolutionary transforming activity and that of purposeful historical activity inherent in human cognition. Thus, the study of the laws of Marxist epistemology has an essential practical goal: to ascertain opportunities of conscious and active revolutionary transforming mass actions and objective possibilities of applying, for the sake of a revolutionary remaking of nature and society, all the intellectual and cultural values accumulated by mankind.

In summation, the essence, contradictions and specific features of the cognitive process are revealed in works by the classics of Marxism-Leninism. Proceeding from them, Soviet and foreign Marxist-Leninist philosophers further develop the theory of the dialectics and methods of cognising nature and society.

Chapter I

MATERIALIST CONCEPTION OF HISTORY

1. Sociological Theories in the History of Philosophy

Problems of social life, including those of production, relations between men, ethical standards of their behaviour, the essence and role of state, causes of wars, etc., have never ceased to concern philosophers.

The Antiquity and the Middle Ages Coherent, more or less consistent conceptions of social life already originated at the time of the emergence and development of class relations, i.e. in early slave-holding states. The ideologists of the slave-owning classes undertook to demonstrate the divine and supernatural origin of royal power and of the king's personality; they relied on religion's authority in justifying the legitimate nature of the slave-owners' dominance. This interpretation is to be found in ancient Egyptian sources, in the code of Hammurabi, the king of Babylon, in literary monuments of ancient India and in the teachings of ancient Chinese philosopher Confucius.

Conceptions openly advocating slave ownership were advanced in ancient Greece. Poet Hesiod (the late 8th-early 7th centuries B.C.) held that relations of dominance and submission were a natural and "normal" condition.

Heraclitus sought to justify slavery by references to the laws of the Universe which allegedly made some people slaves and other masters.

Democritus, the ancient Greek materialist, was the first philosopher to explain the origins of human society. He wrote that originally men led a gregarious life. They had neither kings nor rulers, neither wars nor robberies. Subsequently, having learned how to use fire, they turned to agriculture, invented crafts and established a state order. Within the

state, as a matter of course, they were divided into slaves and slave owners. Democritus defended the state as a social system for maintaining public order. What caused most disruptions of order was envy; therefore, laws were needed to govern all.

Plato's theory on an ideal social system had a major influence on his contemporaries and on the subsequent development of sociology. Plato based his theory on the division of labour which had reached a relatively high level in ancient Greece. He described three social estates, the land-owners and artisans, the warriors and the rulers. Plato held that the division of labour was based on abilities of the human soul. The division of labour and a corresponding social standing were thus natural and in accord with man's disposition. According to Plato, justice demands that everyone do what one is supposed to do, in conformity with one's inherited abilities.

The thinkers of ancient Rome, largely borrowing from ancient Greek theories, concentrated on the drafting of legal rules, law and political conceptions aimed at strengthening the state system based on slave ownership and laying a legal basis for the supremacy of the one class over another.

After the fall of the Roman Empire, the states of the Arab East attained a high level of development late in the first and early second millennia A.D. Of numerous Arabic thinkers, ibn-Bajja and ibn-Khaldun were the ones to pay most attention to problems of social development. Ibn-Bajja (c. 1070-1139) described an ideal society in which there would be no doctors or judges as there would be no diseases, just as subjugation, injustice and violations of laws would no longer exist. The ideal state of society, he held, could be attainable through self-perfection of every individual.

Ibn-Khaldun (1332-1406) attempted to reveal the influence of climate and soils on morals, institutions, the way of life, and in particular, the emergence of tillers of the land and nomads. From his standpoint, state authority and government were people's natural need, a necessary condition for the joint obtaining of the wherewithal for existence.

In medieval Europe, sociological theories were mostly based on religion.

Under feudalism, various opposition conceptions expressing dissatisfaction with the existing order and especially with the dominance of the Catholic Church, gained acceptance. As religious beliefs were widespread, the opposition doctrines were religious in nature and had the form of what was described as heresies. The heretics aimed at restoring the system of early Christian communities, opposed private property, demanded the introduction of common property and opposed the dominance of the gentry.

Thomas Aquinas (1225-1274), a militant ideologist of Catholicism in the Middle Ages, held that power should be controlled by the Church which would see to it that the authorities implement God's laws properly.

The Period of Formation and Development of Capitalism In 16th-century Europe, the feudal system was decaying as the first capitalist enterprises made their appearance, commodity production developed as did home and foreign markets. Proponents of the nascent bourgeois ideology become critical of religious dogmas and feel an urge to conduct independent scientific studies of nature.

Niccolo Machiavelli, an early ideologist of the bourgeoisie (1469-1527), held that society developed due to natural causes, rather than in accordance with God's will. He attempted to deduce the causes from history, human psychology and factual analysis.

The Reformation had an important influence on social theories of the period of formation of capitalism. It was a broad movement which united the diverse interests of the opposition against the feudal Catholic Church and for a new religion. The Reformation movement was led by Martin Luther (1483-1546), Thomas Münzer (c. 1490-1525) and others. The Reformation aimed at undermining the Church's claims on dominating men and advanced the idea of individual attitude to God.

As social contradictions, exploitation and injustices accompanying the development of capitalism became more pro-

nounced, they led to the emergence of various socialist theories, utopian and unrealistic in nature.

English thinker Thomas More (1478-1535) was one of the founders of utopian socialism. In Utopia, or A fruteful and Pleasaunt Worke of the best State of a Publyque Weale, and of the newe Ile called Utopia he criticised the capitalist order, described its vices, injustice and exploitation of man by man. All the people's grievances, he held, were caused by the existence of private property, and its elimination was the only means of achieving universal well-being.

In Italy, a similar conception was advanced by Tommaso Campanella (1568-1639), who wrote Civitas Solis. Thomas More and Tommaso Campanella had an important influence on the development of utopian socialism over the following centuries.

As capitalism developed further, the bourgeoisie came to oppose the dominance of religious and feudal ideology and also the feudal lords' power, which impeded the development of bourgeois economy and private enterprise. The bourgeoisie demanded that all social estate divisions, privileges, duties, etc., be abolished. In the process, the bourgeois ideologists undertook to deduce their demands from eternal principles of natural law. The bourgeoisie portrayed the new social order as a "natural" one, as one in accord with man's nature.

The first to systematise the natural law theory was the Dutch lawyer Hugo Grotius (1583-1645) who held that man's basic quality which makes him different from animals is the striving to a community organised rationally. From it, Grotius deduced the basic requirements, or norms, of natural law: to lay no claim to the property of another; to return what does not belong to us; to keep one's promises; to compensate for the harm done, etc. To avoid conflict with religion, Grotius described this as a divine right.

Theories on natural law were also advanced by other philosophers of this age.

Spinoza (1632-1677) saw man as part of nature; therefore man must be subject to natural laws. Outside society man is weak and helpless. He is looking for protection in a society of those like him; a transition of man from a natural state

into a civil one takes place, and thereafter men create the state as an organisation serving the interests of all.

Thomas Hobbes (1588-1679) holds that men's nature makes them hostile to one another; in a natural environment "homo homini lupus" (man is a wolf to man), and their life is an all-out war. Yet reason makes men unite to form a state.

According to John Locke (1632-1704), the natural condition is that of freedom and equality. He opposed Hobbes on the essence of the natural condition. If an all-out war took place, men would kill one another, he said. Locke also included private property in the domain of natural law.

The sociological thinking of the ideologists of the French bourgeoisie in the 18th century developed under the banner of the Enlightenment, which was aimed against the prejudices, obscurantism and feudal privileges of the Middle Ages.

A prominent philosopher of the Enlightenment, Voltaire (1694-1778), like many other thinkers of the time, used the idea of natural law to criticise the feudal system. Natural laws are laws of reason given to man by nature. From birth, man is free and subject only to natural laws. As for society, it has its own laws dividing it into two classes, the rich and the poor.

Jean-Jacques Rousseau (1712-1778) was the ideologist of the revolutionary democracy of the period and author of the popular works The Origin of Inequality, Contrat Social and others. Social inequality is caused by private property, which originated accidentally, as a matter of guess-work. According to Rousseau, the first man to stumble upon the idea of fencing off a plot of land and saying, "This is mine", and to find people gullible enough to believe this, was the true founder of civic society.

The French materialist philosopher Holbach (1723-1789), like all materialists before Marx, was an idealist as far as social theory was concerned. Man with his spiritual world is a product of social environment. In turn, this environment is created by men, by public opinion. "Opinion rules the world," he used to say. Government plays a major role in the formation of public opinion. In society, man is brought

up to be an egoist pursuing personal benefit. If he wants to benefit from somebody else, he has to be of use to him. For the conduct of these mutually beneficial relations, people have agreed to establish a state. The social contract is based on freedom, property and security. Inequality of men is due to their natural inequality; as for the state, it has to maintain peace in society.

The founder of classical German philosophy Immanuel Kant (1724-1804) viewed the history of the world as the development of human freedom up to a stage which is in conformity with reason. Such a stage is attainable through the natural course of gradual social development, rather than by a violent revolution. Kant advocated the right of ownership of property and, more than that, of men.

An advocate of the interests of the bourgeoisie, Kant nevertheless advanced progressive ideas concerning peace for all time. As social development is aimed at achieving freedom, war must be precluded. Humanity's goal, according to Kant, is peace for all time. It can be established if a universal agreement is concluded by states.

A significant role in the elaboration of philosophical problems of social history was played by Hegel (1770-1831). According to him, the world is based on a continuously developing absolute idea which gives birth to, brings to life and creates the whole observable world, including nature, man and society. He saw universal history as a march of the spirit on earth. The spirit moves in now one people, now another. The people currently imbued by the universal spirit is the dominant people in the given historical era.

Besides these, Hegel also advanced some ideas of positive importance in the history of philosophical analysis of social life. Among these is Hegel's desire to find an objective basis and cause of social life, independent of human consciousness. True, he held that universal spirit was such a basis; nevertheless, this did play a role in the struggle against subjective idealism in understanding social life.

Hegel's desire to overcome the approach to history as a chaos of events and to demonstrate strict consistency of historical processes which advanced social life can also be

regarded as a positive element of Hegel's philosophy of history. Hegel saw history as a single law-governed and inherently justified process of self-development of the spirit or the idea.

A review of the history of philosophical doctrines of society shows that, despite their vast diversity and specific features, the common elements of all of them were: an idealist approach to the analysis of social life; inability to reveal the true laws of historical development; inability to see the people as a true maker of history; protection of the interests of dominant classes; intention to prove that the social system whose ideology the philosopher represents is the best, "natural", and one in accord with reason, etc.; in other words, all pre-Marxian philosophy was incapable of creating a science about society.

Only Marx and Engels were capable of elaborating historical materialism, the science about the general laws of historical development and their reflection in human activity, the science about the revolutionary transformation of the world. They achieved this in a highly developed capitalist society, which revealed the intrinsic processes of exploitation of man by man, by making a generalisation of the historical experience of the working people's class struggle and, in particular, of that of the working class, which had sharply become acute in the early half of the 19th century, by making use of the latest scientific discoveries and by assimilating the positive achievements of previous thinkers.

2. The Prerequisites and Essence of a Materialist Understanding of Social Life

A materialist understanding of history is based on a dialectical approach to the study of social life. This entails viewing society as a living organism in constant development, where all social elements are inherently interrelated and mutually conditioned. Since it reveals the objective, material basis of all social life, explains the essence of human society and studies the laws of universal history historical materialism is a genuinely scientific social theory.

and materialist theory of matter and its movement.

As opposed to pre-Marxian materialism which was only concerned with one form of movement of matter, the mechanical one, Marx and Engels, on the basis of an analysis of latest achievements of natural science, found a multitude of such forms. They demonstrated that the basic forms of movement, viz., the physical, chemical, biological and social ones, are qualitatively definite stages of development of matter, with each form having basic laws common to all the rest; each superior form of movement includes the lower ones and, while not being reducible to the latter, possesses specific laws of its own.

The study of the forms of movement of matter was of fundamental importance for social theory. Primarily, it consisted in treatment of social life as a form of movement of matter. This meant that society is subject to material laws, rather than to some supernatural forces, and that universal laws of the material world operate in society. Second, since social life is the highest form of movement of matter, unique qualitative features of the social form of matter's movement have to be studied.

Society is an uncommonly complicated and multi-faceted system. It comprises what is, in effect, an unlimited quantity of major and minor, complex and simple, known and unknown, relatively stable and constantly changing material and spiritual elements, aspects, properties, directions and tendencies. Historically, they all change, are transformed and progress historically, while influencing one another in a complex and changing manner.

After a profound and comprehensive analysis of social life, Marx and Engels concluded that man's labour is the underlying basis of all social forms of movement. According to Marx, "labour is, in the first place, a process in which both man and Nature participate, and in which man of his own accord starts, regulates, and controls the material reactions between himself and Nature. He opposes himself to

Nature as one of her own forces."¹

Labour is more than metabolism for sustained existence. This kind of action is also made by animals. A characteristic feature of human labour is that it is an activity governing the forces of nature. In the process of labour, man changes external nature while changing his own, by acquiring and improving his human qualities. In other words, it is on the basis of labour that man himself and the entire human society develop.

Taking into account the fundamental importance of labour, one could describe society as a material system whose being is based on the exchange of substances and energies both within itself and with nature by means of labour.

As opposed to animals who find objects required for their subsistence as they exist in nature, man has to change and transform natural objects if he is to satisfy his vital needs. For an animal to find the required object in nature, a perception, or a reflection, of the existing external aspect of objects and of their properties, and the presence of paws, claws and the physical force needed to use and to consume the found object, are sufficient. If the objects were to be purposefully changed and transformed, i.e., if activities were to take place which were not a result of natural evolution, a radical transformation of abilities had to take place, and consciousness was required.

Over an extended historical period, millions of years ago, it took many generations of man's ancestors to gradually learn to manufacture labour implements and at the same time to acquire an ability to reflect essential properties of objects and the laws of their existence; in other words, consciousness was emerging. Thus, abstract thinking, or consciousness, appeared, which was a property isolating man from the animal world.

If one then talks about labour as a specifically human activity, the following is meant: by using labour implements to act on their natural environment so as to transform it

1. Karl Marx, Capital, Vol. I, Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1974, p. 173.

people also change their own nature by developing an ability to work, their labour implements, and by enriching their knowledge. This makes F. Engels' remark that labour is "the prime basic condition for all human existence,"¹ that it is labour that created man, profoundly meaningful.

It was in the process of labour and on its basis that communication between men with its special form, human speech, came into existence.

How did this come about?

It is a fact that if most natural objects were to be transformed, a variety of manipulations and activities had to take place simultaneously. Alone, a man would be unable to accomplish this due to natural limitations. To solve the problem, people had to acquire something not given to them by nature. In the process of labour, they united to form work teams where labour was divided. It was in labour, then, that society was formed as a requisite for human life and as a means of livelihood. Relations between men in society in the process of labour gave birth to, formed the basis of, and developed all human qualities.

Human society was based on joint labour, which made it different from a community of animals, where the inter-relationships are instinctive.

It is in the process of joint labour that human speech also appeared. People made use of it to exchange knowledge and information, and to coordinate their activities. In turn, the development of speech was closely related to intensive intellectual activities and to the development of consciousness.

The most important human qualities, those of labour, consciousness and speech, appeared simultaneously from a historical point of view, and influenced one another. Their emergence and development, however, were based on labour, the most profound prime cause of all that is human. Therefore,

1. F. Engels, Dialectics of Nature, Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1979, p. 170.

human society can be defined as a material system whose essence and basis are formed by purposeful labour enlightened by consciousness. In other words, society is the totality of historically established forms of man's joint activities, the movement of classes, popular masses and individuals, the functioning and development of organisations and institutions.

Social history itself is an integral element of the history of the Earth and of nature. Having appeared on earth as the result of long-term evolution of nature, mankind has gone a long way from submission to forces of nature to a conscious transformation of both the nature and society. Labour was the guiding star on the way.

The Basic Law of Human History

In any philosophical study, the point of departure is the basic question of philosophy, that of relationship of thinking to being, of the spiritual to the material.

A particular solution of the problem, either materialist or idealist, is the basis of every philosophical doctrine, including social theory. If one holds that ideas, the spirit, consciousness are primary in social life, whereas all vital human relations in production, economics, politics, etc., are secondary and derived from the above, then the solution to all the contradictions, the sources of exploitation, the causes of injustice, etc., have to be found in the ideal basis of social life. This approach can lead to no scientific result. Yet if the basic question of philosophy is solved in materialist terms, then the sources of all the vital problems and their solution have to be found in the material foundation of social life, in material relations.

The materialist solution of the fundamental question of philosophy is the point of departure and the premise of materialist understanding of history. Lenin wrote: "Since materialism in general explains consciousness as the outcome of being, and not conversely, then materialism as applied to the social life of mankind has to explain social

consciousness as the outcome of social being.¹

Marxism has scientifically substantiated the idea that a materialist solution to all problems of social life, and the nature, course and essence of the analysis of all historical phenomena, processes, facts and events, is based on a materialist solution of the problem of relationship of social being to social consciousness. By means of the materialist solution of the fundamental question of philosophy as it applies to social life, Marx discovered the basic law of social life, according to which social being determines social consciousness, while social consciousness, in turn, actively influences social being. The law reveals the dialectics of interaction of individual spheres of social life; it is the fundamental and most general law in social life. All the other principles and laws of social life are either an expression of some aspects of the basic law or a description of essential interrelationships within social being or social consciousness.

Social being is the most general category of historical materialism used to denote the objectively real process of human life, which includes the totality of labour implements, relations of men vis-à-vis one another and as regards nature in the process of social production, the economic and political structure of society, the relations between classes, nations and social groups, and the practical implementation of dominant customs, morals and traditions in family and everyday life.

Social being is in continuous development; for each succeeding generation, it represents the underlying basis of life, being as it is an objective feature which determines living conditions, serves as an impetus for its development and imparts to it peculiar features of life. In spite of this, however, social being is subsequently developed and transformed by a new generation, which thus prepares the basis for the subsequent ones.

1. V.I. Lenin, Collected Works, Vol. 21, p. 55.

For a correct understanding of social being, one has to bear in mind that it is not just a sum total of some components, and in particular of those mentioned in the definition. On the contrary, social being represents a unity, an organic interrelationship of all its components; it is a single whole, an independent social phenomenon which differs from all the properties and features inherent in each of its components.

At the same time, attention has to be drawn to the fact that not all components of social being are equally relevant, both within the system of being and in social life as a whole. The production of material goods is of decisive importance for social life in its entirety.

Social being varies in accordance with historical periods and countries. The generation born in the mid-twentieth century have seen one set of living conditions in capitalist countries, another set in socialist ones, and a still different set in developing ones. Each of the groups of these countries has its own level and nature of production as well as specific economic, social and political relations.

In the course of the world revolutionary process and intensive revolutionary activity by this generation of workers in all countries, the new social being is being created which will serve as the basic foundation for the life of future generations.

Peace, which is pursued by Communists, all revolutionaries and progressives on this planet, is the primary, basic prerequisite for human life.

Social consciousness is a more general category of historical materialism which denotes society's spiritual life and reflects social being. Social consciousness is not equivalent to the consciousness of an individual person; it represents the outlook, ideas and conceptions characteristic of a given society in general or of an individual social group. In a class society, class consciousness has a class nature. As the social being of the dominant classes and that of working people is not the same, their social consciousness is not the same either.)

Social consciousness is a reflection of social being in science and philosophy, in works of art, in political and legal ideology, in morals, religion, mythology, customs and traditions, popular wisdom, psychological makeup, in social norms and views of classes, of social groups and of mankind as a whole. There is a continuous interaction between the individual and social consciousness. Standards of consciousness, having been evolved historically, become personal convictions, a source of moral prescriptions, of aesthetic feelings and notions. In turn, personal ideas and convictions acquire the nature of a social value and of a social force when they become part of social consciousness, acquire the nature of a standard of behaviour and a universal relevance.

Therefore, social being and social consciousness embrace the basic domains of social life, the material and the spiritual.

The basic law of social life is that social being determines social consciousness. Still, social consciousness is not a passive result of changes in being; on the contrary, it actively influences the latter. It can serve either as an impetus or as an obstacle to its development; it can restrain some aspects of the material process of real life and serve as an incentive for others. Like Marxist-Leninist theory in general, the law of relationship of social being and social consciousness is of an enormous practical importance in revolutionary struggle, in the building of a new society and in a conscious and scientifically substantiated management of social development.

The specific mechanism of interaction of social being and social consciousness is revealed, in particular, in a study of the correlation of freedom and necessity in social life.

Historical Necessity vs.
Freedom

Is man free in social life? What
underlies his everyday actions
and attitude to society? Is man
capable of changing the existing

social order at will? These, and similar, questions have always had a place of importance in the history of social thinking. Non-Marxist philosophers and sociologists, when

studying questions of the type, adopt two extreme positions, that of fatalism, which regards human activities in history as pre-determined by supernatural forces or hereditary biological makeup of man, or that of voluntarism, according to which human actions are arbitrary and not pre-determined.

The law of interaction of social being and social consciousness serves as a basis for a dialectical and materialist solution to the question of correlation of, on the one hand, man's will, desires and intentions, i.e., human freedom, and, on the other, of objectively effective material laws of social development beyond man's command, i.e., of historical necessity.

It was in the light of the basic law of social life that the deficiencies in approaches of old, pre-Marxian materialists, who, sincerely as they tried, were incapable of solving the problem of correlation of freedom and necessity, became understandable as well. They failed to understand the social nature of man, the objective social laws of human life; they only saw man as an individual, while regarding society as a conglomeration, or a simple sum total, of individuals.

Relying on the proposition that all human qualities are formed in joint labour and that society obeys the basic law of interaction of social being and social consciousness, Marxism built its analysis around society, rather than the individual. It then became clear that necessity in social life was not some kind of a determining factor or a process taking place outside men, behind their backs and dominating them; on the contrary, historical necessity is historical social activity itself, and this necessity comprises natural actions by men and their activities as a necessary result.

Necessity is the social being of men themselves in historical development. Men are the makers of their own history, yet the making of it is not arbitrary; men are not free to choose any conditions they please for their activity. Historical necessity means that man's energy, desires and conscious activity are limited by conditions under which man is placed by social being inherited from previous generations. The nature, laws, properties and real capabilities of social

being established previously become for each specific generation a necessity, independent of its will and desires, which cannot be disregarded or ignored.

The conception of freedom and of the possibility of making use of it is deduced by Marx from historical necessity. It is due to the fact that necessity and historical regularity are never more than a specific result of activity being developed by men themselves, and necessity is the being of society as such, that necessity can be transformed, not in the sense of it being eliminated or abolished (which is possible), but in the sense of theoretical comprehension and practical application of laws of necessity and of purposeful practical formation of a social being under which men will live and act.

Various possibilities are always open to mankind, and advancement of society toward utilisation of favourable options depends on the unity of action of the popular masses.

It is historical necessity, therefore, that underlies the possibility of freedom for men and for society which is the maker of its history. The conception of historical freedom elaborated by Marx has nothing to do with conceptions of arbitrariness, subjective will, desires, etc. Freedom is brought about by cognition of objective laws (i.e., the laws of historical necessity) and by an ability to utilise them. Freedom is not passive knowledge. Hegel's famous dictum "freedom is recognised necessity" is not quite true. Freedom is scientifically substantiated, purposeful activity by the popular masses aimed at transforming society and nature. Freedom is based on necessity.

It should be pointed out that determinism, objective necessity and real laws of nature and of social development, taken by themselves, do not result in freedom, even if they are known to men. One can assume, in principle, that men who are aware of social laws would still not use their knowledge to actively interfere, in practical terms, in social life. Are they, in effect, free? Of course, not, in spite of the fact that historical determinism offers them the requisites for freedom. The supreme manifestation of freedom finds its reflection in a substantiated activity of revolutionary

transformation which changes social relations, old social being and the mode of influencing nature. An understanding of history as revolutionary practice means that it is only a revolutionary social class, which consciously transforms all the activities and life of a society, that can be genuinely free.

The attainment of freedom is not a moral or a purely cognitive task; it requires historical activity of the masses of working people aimed at fully mastering tendencies of historical development on the basis of a scientific analysis of these tendencies, and at turning them from the inevitable necessity of a spontaneous process into the freedom of conscious action, that of practice of class struggle or a purposeful management of development of a socialist society and of the corresponding transformation of the environment.

Freedom, seen as the activity of masses, is primarily the freedom of a revolutionary class, of a party and of a scientifically-managed society. Personal freedom is only effected through the freedom of a collective, or of a society. It is only in a collective that an individual acquires the means which enable him to develop his inclinations comprehensively; therefore, it is only in a collective that personal freedom is possible. Yet personal freedom does not mean that man is totally free of the free society. Lenin pointed out that absolute freedom of personality, not limited by anything, was pure fiction, as one cannot live in a society and be free of it. A free society is still governed by objective social laws; in it, some rules, duties and rights exist which maintain social order and the very freedom of the society. It is the individual who knows the laws and social requirements and acts accordingly that is free. Personal freedom, therefore, is directly related to social necessity. If the question of personal freedom is to be solved, one has to turn to the social system and find out whether a society is free, whether it is effecting a reasonable, purposeful and scientifically substantiated transformation of its social being, whether it is guided in its activities by a knowledge of objective laws of social development, etc. It will then become clear whether a real basis for personal

freedom exists in the society or the slogan of personal freedom has been made an empty phrase with no basis in the reality of social life.

As noted above, the production of material goods in a society is the basic element of social being.

3. Material Production, the Basis of Social Life

Production Structure.

Not only do men create material

Productive Forces

products for their existence in
the process of production; they

also produce and reproduce their social relations.

In the process of joint labour men interact, on the one hand, with nature, and on the other, with one another. These two sets of relationships constitute the inalienably linked aspects of any specific production activity.

The relations between society and nature take place through the intermediary of productive forces; relations between men in the process of production represent production relations.

Let us examine the structure of productive forces.

Productive forces are the forces and means used by society to influence nature so as to transform it purposefully.
The nature of this influence on nature and the mode of acquisition of means of livelihood represent the mode of production.

Understandably, it is not the entire environment that man influences in the process of labour, but only individual objects he wants to change so as to make them fit his needs. As soon as man begins to act on a natural object in some manner, the object ceases to be a merely natural one; it becomes part of social life, the sphere of labour. It becomes an object of labour.

An object, process or phenomenon acted on by man's labour become objects of labour. Everything man uses to act upon the object of labour represents means of labour. A means of labour is a thing or a set of things placed by man between himself and the object of labour and used as a conduit of his action on the object.

Means of labour comprise objects used by man to act on the object of labour directly such as an axe, a spade, a

machine, etc.; these are all labour implements. Besides these, a wider meaning of the term "labour means" includes all the material conditions required for the process of labour to take place at all. Some examples of these labour means are production buildings, canals, roads, etc.

If production is to take place, i.e., if the needed products are to be manufactured, the mere existence of means of labour or an object of labour is insufficient. They have to be combined for the purposes of production. Taken together, the means of labour and the object of labour are called means of production.

The means of production account for the most important part of society's productive forces. Yet taken in isolation, the means of production, no matter how advanced, can produce nothing. They are but dead objects of nature transformed by man. It is only when they are involved in man's labour that they become means of labour, are included in the production process and become material elements of social life.

Productive forces, which include means of labour, should then of necessity comprise men who set in motion the means of production, i.e., labour force.

Labour force, or ability to work is the totality of physical and spiritual abilities of an organism, of a living human being, used every time when it produces some articles which can satisfy some human need or other.

Labour is always collective. A division of labour always exists in society, and the higher the level of development of production and the more advanced the means of production, the greater the division of labour.

As a productive force, man must have some labour skills, and possess some knowledge of means of production, principles of the production process, properties of the labour object, etc. As production develops, the knowledge becomes increasingly complex, while its volume increases continuously. The knowledge is developed by science which thus influences the development of society's productive forces.

Practical applications of science and the process of materialisation of knowledge represent the process of transformation of science into a direct productive force. That

science is a productive force at the present juncture means that modern means of production are developed on the basis of scientific achievements; that science elaborates the principles and modes of the production process, of production technology; that science provides the knowledge having acquired which man can become the labour force in modern production; that under socialism social sciences serve as a basis of social production planning and of the selection of the best options for the development of science and technology; the strength of Marxist-Leninist science under socialism is also reflected in the fact that on its basis, a communist attitude to work is formed.

Historically, social productive forces are in constant development under the influence of social needs and in a dialectical interrelationship with production relations. Governed by the laws of development of production in its entirety, productive forces also develop under the influence of the laws of their own.

Laws of Development of Productive Forces The laws of development of productive forces represent essential relations and correlations within objective reality which underlie and determine the essence and historical process of the development of means of labour, as well as those of man as a productive force, and the relations thereof.

Of fundamental importance is the law of the determining role of nature vis-à-vis the nature of technology, of means of labour. This law explains what conditions the form, the design of a technical device. If man is to transform objects and to satisfy his need, he must cognise the properties and laws of transformed natural objects and create a corresponding implement. The design of the implement is determined by the laws cognised and used as well as by natural laws, properties. According to Lenin, "mechanical and chemical technique serves human ends just because its character (essence) consists in its being determined by external conditions (the laws of nature)."¹

¹. V.I. Lenin, Collected Works, Vol. 38, p. 188.

The law of the determining role of natural laws as regards the nature of technology and means of production is of great importance for understanding the historical development of the means of production and of productive forces in general. The sequence seen in history in the development of means of labour, the stages in development of technology and its universal and historical course are, in the final analysis, also determined by natural laws. It is not on an arbitrary basis or in accordance with purely subjective wishes that men work out designs for individual mechanisms, but in strict accordance with, and on the basis of laws and properties of the natural processes, phenomena and objects they make use of. Doubtlessly, social requirements resulting from the development of socio-economic relations are the source and prime motive power of progress. Yet here we deal with the determining feature underlying the progressive transition of technology from, for instance, simple machines to steam engines, from steam engines to the electric motor, i.e., with historical sequences in the development of technology. The succession is governed by the succession in the cognition of the laws of nature, its structure, relationships and correlations.

We are thus approaching the basic law of development of science, of knowledge. According to Lenin, "cognition is the process of the submersion (of the mind) in an inorganic nature for the sake of subordinating it to the power of the subject... . Human thought goes endlessly deeper from appearance to essence, from essence of the first order, as it were, to essence of the second order, and so on without end."¹ Nature is not a random set of various phenomena, processes and objects. It is a composite system with laws of its own and with a strictly definite structure. Some laws and levels of the structure are perceptible by man (external phenomena), some less so (the essence of the first order), while still others find their place deep within natural relationships (the essence of the second order), and so on, endlessly.

1. V.I. Lenin, Collected Works, Vol. 38, pp. 194, 251.

Historically, human cognition has been following these steps, or orders in nature. As man masters increasingly advanced structural levels of nature and its essential elements, he creates corresponding increasingly sophisticated means of labour, while developing himself as a productive force. Historically, a strict sequence is established in the development of productive forces. Mankind is unable to skip over a stage of development. It would not have been possible, for example, to create nuclear and laser technology before that of electricity, or electrical technology earlier than the steam engine. The objective structure of nature would prevent this. Mankind was forced to develop means of production and all productive forces in the historical order in which corresponding natural processes are objectively correlated; thermodynamic processes are more cognisable than electrical ones, to be followed by nuclear processes. The correlation of natural processes and man's activity to develop science and technology is such that man follows nature while facing the objective world; man is dependent on it and uses it to determine his activity. Nature and its structure predetermine the course of and basic stages in the development of science, technology and productive forces in general. Mankind could not have created an electric motor before it had mastered mechanical movement; nor could it have made use of nuclear energy before it had harnessed electric power. The transition of knowledge and practical activities to a new structural natural level, or to an essence of a higher order, signifies a more or less profound revolution in science, technology and productive forces.

The law of determining importance of natural laws vis-a-vis the essence of technology and labour means demonstrates the manner in which the means of labour are based on their contacts and relationships with nature. Yet the other side of the means of labour is related to man whose production capabilities and natural inclinations also have a significant influence on technology and on the nature and course of historical development of labour means. This aspect of technological progress and development of labour means is

governed by another basic law, the law of transfer of production functions from man to technical facilities. The entire progress of machinery consists in the replacement of man's labour by machines. The gradual replacement of manual labour by machines is the essence of technological progress. As technology advances man's labour is increasingly supplanted by a number of sophisticated machines. The law reveals the essence of technological progress. Like the law of the determining role of natural laws as regards the essence of technology and means of production, this law underlies the general historical development of productive forces, its nature and general course. A study of the laws reveals the essence of the current scientific and technological revolution and demonstrates its place in the historical development of science, technology and productive forces in general.

Revolution in Science and Technology

If one examines manual labour which was predominant in the period preceding the introduction of machinery, it is easily

seen that it is composed of three main functions: executive (man uses his hands to perform the necessary manipulations with manual implements); that of propulsion (performed with the force of man's muscles); and managerial (man's thinking purposefully controls the entire labour process).

The progress of machinery consists in the creation of devices to which these functions are consistently transferred one after another. Each transfer represents a revolution in machine technology.

It should be noted that this sequence of transfers of functions is strictly observed in the history of technology. The sequence expresses the essence of the law under consideration -- the correlation of human organs: the wrist, muscles and the thinking brain. It represents a kind of a programme for historical development of technology. Indeed, a power mechanism cannot be used in a production process where a manual implement is set in motion by hand. Technology and means of production of necessity develop historically along the course where man's functions, initially that of execution, then that of propulsion followed by that of management, are taken over

by machines.

The industrial revolution in the 18th century was due to the invention of a number of machines which took over the executive function. It was the first revolution in machine technology which opened up the way to mechanisation of production.

The next breakthrough in the development of technology, the second revolution, was due to the invention of the steam engine, followed by other power machines, including electric motors, turbines, etc. The machines take over man's propulsion function.

Pointing out the historically necessary sequence in the development of means of labour, K. Marx stated: "It was ... the inventions of machines that made a revolution in the form of steam-engines necessary. ... But assuming that he /man/ is acting simply as a motor, that a machine has taken the place of his tool, it is evident that he can be replaced by natural forces."¹ The second revolution opened up a wide range of possibilities for integrated mechanisation of production. With highly mechanised production, the only function left to man is that of managing the production process.

The mid-20th century saw the creation of various types of automatic devices to which man transferred his third function, that of operating machines and managing production processes.

It is the creation of automated systems and the transfer of the managerial function from man to automatic machines that constitute the current revolution in technology. With automation, there is no longer a need for man to participate in the production process directly; man performs the tasks of monitoring and observing the production process.

The withdrawal of man from immediate involvement in the production process creates basically new conditions for the development of technology. Essentially, they are as follows. At the time when man was a component of machinery systems and of the production process, the functioning and development

1. Karl Marx, Capital, Vol. I, p. 355.

of machine technology, according to Marx, had to "meet with certain natural obstructions in the weak bodies and the strong wills of its human attendants".¹ Yet at the time when, following the introduction of automatic systems man is no longer directly involved in the production process, the machinery system, as Marx noted, "has a productive organism that is purely objective."² The creation of machine technology and the development of technological principles are no longer limited by the need to take into account the subjective factor, i.e., man's productive abilities. At this stage engineering and technology only depend on the possibilities offered by the cognised laws of nature and social requirements. Thus conditions are established under which, in the first place, the rate of technological progress is vastly accelerated, and secondly, technical facilities and industrial output produced become substantial and increasingly diversified.

The development of engineering and technology accelerates the development of science and broadens the field of research; in turn, this influences engineering, technology and social production as a whole.

Science is a social activity aimed at cognition of universal laws and acquisition of knowledge. Its historical development consists in the fact that man's mind increasingly penetrates the essence of natural processes and reveals ever more profound relationships between universal phenomena. The history of science also witnessed revolutions related to substantial advances in cognition of nature. The latest revolution in natural science began at the turn of the century. A comprehensive analysis of the revolution was made in Lenin's Materialism and Empirio-Criticism (1908). Its essence lies in the fact that human knowledge, instead of merely cognising substantial laws of individual phenomena it was previously engaged in, undertook to master the fundamental processes underlying all observable natural phenomena.

1. Karl Marx, Capital, Vol. I, p. 380.

2. *Ibid.*, p. 364.

The latest revolution in natural science laid the scientific foundation for the current revolution in science and technology. Scientific achievements offer a basically new possibility of managing natural processes in accordance with pre-set socially relevant goals, rather than simply using individual natural processes in production. This is the essence of current revolutionary transformations in science. The creation of man-made materials with pre-determined properties, scientifically substantiated and purposeful modification of heredity in living organisms, research in controlled thermonuclear fusion and in weather control, etc., are just some examples of the possibilities already offered by modern science.

According to the first basic law of development of means of labour, the essence of labour means arrived at in the course of the current revolution in science and technology is determined by the natural laws revealed by science, which are effective at the profound structural level of nature studied by modern science. The design of nuclear facilities, the principles of chemical technology and the structure of space vehicles reflect natural laws which mankind has been mastering in the 20th century. Science is currently becoming a productive force in social development.

The revolution in technology and that in science are interrelated, and the current revolution in productive forces is therefore referred to as the scientific and technological revolution. Essentially it offers the possibility of using automated systems to manage natural processes in accordance with social requirements, i.e., of making natural processes follow the course desired by man and achieve the required result, which means that the natural process becomes a technological, or industrial one.

The current scientific and technological revolution is taking place in various forms and to various extents in all countries. Its social importance and socio-economic consequences, like the consequences of the development of productive forces in general, are directly dependent on the social system. Under capitalism, with the dominance of private ownership of means of production, the scientific and technologi-

of machine technology, according to Marx, had to "meet with certain natural obstructions in the weak bodies and the strong wills of its human attendants".¹ Yet at the time when, following the introduction of automatic systems man is no longer directly involved in the production process, the machinery system, as Marx noted, "has a productive organism that is purely objective."² The creation of machine technology and the development of technological principles are no longer limited by the need to take into account the subjective factor, i.e., man's productive abilities. At this stage engineering and technology only depend on the possibilities offered by the cognised laws of nature and social requirements. Thus conditions are established under which, in the first place, the rate of technological progress is vastly accelerated, and secondly, technical facilities and industrial output produced become substantial and increasingly diversified.

The development of engineering and technology accelerates the development of science and broadens the field of research; in turn, this influences engineering, technology and social production as a whole.

Science is a social activity aimed at cognition of universal laws and acquisition of knowledge. Its historical development consists in the fact that man's mind increasingly penetrates the essence of natural processes and reveals ever more profound relationships between universal phenomena. The history of science also witnessed revolutions related to substantial advances in cognition of nature. The latest revolution in natural science began at the turn of the century. A comprehensive analysis of the revolution was made in Lenin's Materialism and Empirio-Criticism (1908). Its essence lies in the fact that human knowledge, instead of merely cognising substantial laws of individual phenomena it was previously engaged in, undertook to master the fundamental processes underlying all observable natural phenomena.

1. Karl Marx, Capital, Vol. I, p. 380.

2. *Ibid.*, p. 364.

pursued by those in whose hands the means are to be found.

Production Relations

nature and to the development of modes of production.

Yet it is not only their attitude to nature that men develop in the process of production; relations between men are also developed, i.e., their production relations are improved.

Both the mode of production and the production relations change historically, as people improve them to meet their requirements. Making a historical analysis of the capitalist mode of production, Marx stated: "The production relations corresponding to this specific, historically determined mode of production - relations which human beings enter into during the process of social life, in the creation of their social life - possess a specific, historical and transitory character."¹

The discovery of the mode of production and of production relations corresponding to it is a most important discovery credited to Marx. It made possible a complete scientific explanation of all phenomena of social development and a science of the revolutionary transformation of social life. With reference to the essence of Marx's theory of class struggle, Lenin pointed out: "Taking as its starting-point a fact that is fundamental to all human society, namely, the mode of procuring the means of subsistence, it connected up with this the relations between people formed under the influence of the given modes of procuring the means of subsistence, and showed that this system of relations ("relations of production", to use Marx's terminology) is the basis of society, which clothes itself in political and legal forms and in definite trends of social thought."²

Production relations are sometimes approached too narrowly, as the relations people enter into in the process of their direct involvement in production, like relations

The historical development of productive forces leads to changes in men's attitudes to

1. Karl Marx, Capital, Vol. 3, Moscow, 1971, p. 878.

2. V.I. Lenin, Collected Works, Vol. 1, p. 410

cal revolution makes old contradictions more acute and leads to new ones, while its results are beneficial to the owners of means of production and the monopoly bourgeoisie; under socialism, as the means of production are public property, the scientific and technological revolution is a basic element in the process of establishing and developing the material and technical base of a new society and serves the purpose of improving the well-being of the entire people. The essence of the productive forces, the manner in which they are being used, the degree of application of individual scientific achievements and of development of individual fields of engineering and science, etc., depend on the society, its goals, requirements and tasks. The relationship of the means of production and productive forces with society is revealed in the law of influence of social goals and requirements on the nature and course of development of productive forces.

In pursuit of profit and of the goal of amassing capitals, capitalist society channels all scientific and technological achievements into maximum exploitation of man and nature, driving workers to exhaustion and destroying the natural environment; it uses the current scientific and technological revolution primarily to create weapons of mass destruction, military-industrial complexes and to militarise all social life.

Satisfaction of material and cultural needs of all society's members is the goal of socialist production and the task set by socialism for the development of technology, productive forces and production as a whole. This changes the social nature of productive forces while making them humane in nature, for scientific and technological advances are used for the purpose of making men spiritually richer and comprehensively developed.

The law demonstrates that it is not science and technology that are to blame for the calamities ascribed to them under capitalism, but the social system which sets the goals and purposes of making profit by exploiting man. Any means of labour, from a primitively shaped stone to modern electronics and nuclear plants, can be used both to the benefit and to the detriment of man. Their use is determined by the goals

ry, derivative and therefore not the main element of relationships between men. Law itself is not a part of production relations. Relations to means of production are based on social relations between men, with private ownership of means of production creating relations of domination and submission, i.e., the relations of exploitation, and public ownership underlying relations of friendship and comradely mutual assistance.

Depending on the nature of property, another important element of production relations is established, that of relations of distribution of material goods produced. Private ownership of means of production underlies distribution in the form of profits accrued to the property owner and in the form of wages, or the price of workers' labour; public ownership under socialism entails distribution of material goods in accordance with the quantity and quality of socially useful labour. Under socialism, social funds are also beneficial to all members of the society, and to everyone in the same measure, through the system of public education, health and child care, etc., run by the socialist state and by social organisations.

The totality of production relations forms the basis, or economic structure, of a society. A scientific understanding of social life, of social, political, ideological and other relations is impossible without a study of production relations dominant in a society. Social progress, social transitions from one historical stage to another, and revolutionary changes take place on the basis of changes in production relations.

It is now clear that ascertaining the sources and laws of development of social production is important in analysing social life in its entirety.

Production Development:
Its Sources and Motive
Forces

Social theories.

In most general terms, it is the struggle of opposites,

The sources and motive forces of changes in natural, social and spiritual phenomena have always taken a prominent place in philosophical and sociolo-

between workers, or those between a foreman, a team leader and a worker, or those between individual shops, specialised enterprises, etc. Relations of this kind are not production relations in the Marxist meaning of the term. These are technological relations, based on the manufacturing technology of a specific product and, as a whole, forming part of the sphere of productive forces. It is technological relations that are often referred to by theoreticians of "the new industrial society", the "post-industrial society", "the technetronic society" and of other doctrines on industrialism, in their vain attempts to substantiate the idea of a "technological determinism", according to which engineering and technology determine all socio-economic, political and even moral relations among men in a society. In the process, they sometimes make references to Marx, in their attempts to prove that Marx allegedly took a similar position. In reality, however, Marx, Engels and Lenin were engaged in a constant struggle against these primitive sociological conceptions.

Production relations are relations between major groups of men in a society -- social classes, social strata and social groups in the social production process. These are broad social relations which, according to Marx, people enter into in the process of social production of their lives.

Production relations comprise primarily relations to means of production, expressed in the nature and forms of ownership of means of production. In its essence, ownership represents the relation of one class to another through the intermediary of things (means of production), rather than a relationship vis-à-vis objects.

In principle, there can be alternative relations to means of production, with the latter either belonging to an entire society, or owned by an individual or a part of the society. In other words, the means of production can be either public or private property. Ownership means more than just a legally established right to a thing. What ownership represents is primarily a real relationship between men, where the intermediary is their relation to things, the latter being means of production. This economic nature of ownership finds its reflection in a legal right to property. Here law is seconda-

develop; they have no inherent need to improve their vital organs used to satisfy their vital requirements. Their evolution means adjustment to the changing environment, rather than progress. What, then, makes the development of human society different from the evolution of the animal world?

The basic elements of the answer to the question, like those of many others, are contained in labour, a specifically human activity.

Attention should primarily be drawn to the fact that labour is collective, or social, and that it remains so even if in a specific situation a man can be working alone. A collective always has a much more developed ability to work than an individual member of the collective does. This is mostly due to the fact that in the collective labour is divided, or specialised, with everyone developing specific skills.

In the process of creating a product of labour, the collective imparts to it properties in a variety which surpasses the abilities of every individual. The object thus created is the material embodiment of the collective's strength, reason and abilities. In the labour process, therefore, man derives enrichment from labour implements, labour objects and the process of labour itself, while developing human qualities, abilities and requirements. Every individual absorbs the totality of the collective's abilities, as well as those of society. This happens to all members of the collective and, consequently, to the collective as a whole.

Continuous development of man and human society thus takes place under the influence of its inherent source, the interaction of individual and collective, man and society, among other inalienable opposites.

The development of man, his forces and capabilities entails a broadening of the range of demands put forward by his life and activities, and an increase in requirements, i.e., material requirements, those concerned with labour, communication, cognition, pleasure, etc. In the process of labour, production experience is accumulated, as well as labour skills and abilities; thus, man as a labour force is

or the contradiction inherent in a phenomenon in development, that is the internal source of development.

If one is to analyse the sources of development of social production, and those of society as a whole, one has to examine the question of how this general philosophical provision is made more specific when applied to social life.

To begin with, the concepts "a source" and "the motive forces" of social development have to be made more precise.

When one talks about the source of development what is meant is the most profound cause and the actual *raison d'être* of the phenomenon's development, and the inherent motivation of development. Revealing the sources of development should serve as the basis for understanding the developing phenomenon as a whole.

The motive forces are the direct executors of the action of the source of development. In a specific interrelationship of phenomena, the motive forces become immediate causes, yet what makes them different from the source is that a more profound reason underlies their action, while the source, taken in a cause-and-effect relationship, becomes a primary reason, being causa sui. Which means that an analysis of social processes should reveal their essence and go down to their basics, rather than remain superficial vis-à-vis these phenomena. The source of development is contained in the root-causes of the phenomenon's being itself. It follows that if the source of social development is to be revealed, labour, among all factors influencing its development, should be given priority, and that it is in it that inherent primary causes of development of all that is human and of all social processes should be found. Labour itself also develops.

If finding the source of development of labour is approached superficially, the task seems quite easy, as people appear to develop their labour and means of labour so as to meet their requirements. This approach is by and large correct and sufficient for certain purposes. A more careful analysis, however, reveals that it remains unclear why the requirements change and develop and how the requirements serve as an impetus for the development of means of labour and of labour as a whole. With animals, vital needs do not

ed the question of requirements as a source of development in the following manner: a need is always "the need for new production, and therefore provides the conceptual, intrinsically actuating reason for production, which is the pre-condition for production. ...If it is evident that externally production supplies the object of consumption, it is equally evident that consumption posits the object of production as a concept, an internal image, a need, a motive, a purpose. Consumption furnishes the object of production in a form that is still subjective. There is no production without a need, but consumption re-creates the need."¹

If the ideal factor is disregarded, it is impossible to understand the essence of the source of development or of development itself. "Everything which sets men in motion must go through their minds."² It must be borne in mind, however, that even if requirements as a source of development are the reflection of objective contradictions between production proper and consumption, their social nature makes them objective. The nature of requirements is always social, even if in some situations they appear personal, since man's perception of individual requirements is that of a social being.

If requirements which represent something necessary for an individual person are disregarded, and requirements are seen only from the viewpoint of their social significance, social requirements can be defined as everything that is already necessary for the society's functioning but still not in existence. Requirements are a reflection of objective tendencies of development of social production in images and purposes, which is why they are always above the level achieved by the latter. Requirements can be material, social, spiritual, intellectual, etc. A most important element of economic relations, requirements manifest themselves in the form of interests which have a major role to play as incentives for social development.

1. K. Marx, A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy, Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1977, pp. 196-197
2. K. Marx and F. Engels, Selected Works in Three volumes, Vol. 3, Moscow, 1970, p. 367.

undergoing development, based, in turn, on the need to improve the means of production, i.e., the means and objects of labour. Within the system of productive forces, man is the most mobile and revolutionary element.

It is thus in the process of labour and production that requirements which serve as incentives for production development arise and develop; it is in the same labour process, however, that men's real possibilities and ability to satisfy their needs are formed and developed.

If one is to ascertain the manner in which the sources of production progress are established in social production, one has to examine some basic concepts of social production.

The concept of social production is used both in its narrow and its wide sense. In the first instance it stands for social activity aimed, specifically, at the direct manufacture, or creation, of individual products. Yet this kind of production cannot exist by itself. It is directly linked to consumption of products and means of production. In social life, the linkage of production and consumption takes place via distribution and exchange. Thus social production in its broader sense takes place; it includes production proper (i.e., the manufacture of products), distribution, exchange and consumption. Clearly, the entire system of social production gravitates towards two opposites, production proper and consumption. The opposites are dialectically interrelated. "Production," Marx said, "is thus at the same time consumption, and consumption is at the same time production. Each is simultaneously its opposite."¹

Taking its place between production and consumption is the requirements, a concentrated reflection of the unity of the two opposites, the living embodiment of the contradiction between the two. Thus, the requirement, with its inherent contradiction, is the source of development of both production proper and consumption, as well as of the entire social production system and of society as a whole. K. Marx explain-

¹. K. Marx, A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy, Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1977, p. 196.

needs, or requirements, and the provision of incentives for labour, which go beyond previous requirements, represent a major progressive role of capitalism; it was this that enabled capitalism, albeit in the form of barbaric exploitation, to accomplish rapid and large-scale development of productive forces and of production as a whole. What exactly are the requirements which were established historically?

In the course of development of machine production and its specialisation, as scientific consciousness progressed and technological applications of scientific knowledge broadened, and as capitalism was being established, qualitatively new requirements were emerging which served as a specific source of social development at that stage of economic development. The requirements, which emerged historically, were borne of production itself, i.e., these were social requirements arising from social production and exchange. Under natural economy, for instance, in a pre-capitalist period, engineering or chemical enterprises were not required. Yet at a time when machinery and chemical fertilizers are used in agriculture and its output is for sale, the engineering and chemical enterprises become a social necessity.¹

This provision is very important for understanding economic problems faced by developing countries. In many of the latter, new socio-economic requirements have not yet been formed. The construction of industrial enterprises, therefore, more often than not seems a paradox within the system of dominant social requirements which, to a major extent, are still incipient. In this case, a system of economic measures is required, within which the formation of new requirements should have priority.

Under capitalism, private capitalist profit, or super-profit, is an expression of the new requirements. Capitalist production is not aimed at meeting material or spiritual requirements of working men. True, a great many things and use-values are produced under capitalism; yet this is not because such is its purpose; in this manner the purpose

I.

K. Marx, F. Engels, Works, Vol. 46, Part II, p. 18
(in Russian).

Requirements on the Rise

In social life, requirements are subject to the law of rising requirements discovered by

the classics of Marxism-Leninism. The essence of the law has been revealed by Marx, "The satisfaction of the first need, the action of satisfying and the instrument of satisfaction which has been acquired, leads to new needs; and this creation of new needs is the first historical act."¹

Governed by the law, in their historical development requirements pass several basic stages. The requirements also underlie the specific motive forces of society's development, as well as the entire organisation of material life.

That the nature of requirements as the source of development and of the motive forces is historical means that a general, or abstract, consideration thereof is insufficient for an understanding of social life's development. Their specific manifestations have to be ascertained at all basic stages of social development.

Early in social history, vital requirements, or natural needs in food, housing, clothing, etc., were the source of development.

The source made population growth, along with class struggle and other motive forces, the decisive force determining the development of social production. The need to provide for the growing population was a motive force specific to social development in the pre-capitalist socio-economic formations.

Capitalism is characterised by essential changes in the source of development of production and the entire society.

Natural requirements still exist and develop, yet they are now secondary as a source of development. "As the ceaseless striving for the general form of wealth," Marx said, "capital forces labour beyond the limits of labour's natural needs" and as a result "natural necessity disappears in its immediate form, because natural needs have been replaced by the historically produced needs."² The creation of these new

1. K. Marx, F. Engels, Collected Works, Vol. 5, Moscow, 1976,

2. p. 42.

2. K. Marx, F. Engels, Works, Vol. 46, Part I, p. 281 (in Russian).

development, bring forth motive forces which correspond to them, such as socialist emulation, material and moral incentives, drives to improve the quality and effectiveness of social production, etc. Social involvement, initiatives and a creative approach to work become increasingly important motive forces for social development under socialism.

Under socialism, a new source of social progress is also being established. Increasingly, the need for comprehensive development of all members of society is becoming such a source.

Comprehensive personal development is more than a great humanistic purpose for communism; at the highest stage of social development it becomes a need, a social and historical requirement. This is due to the fact that it is only a comprehensively developed man that can manage natural processes rationally, as well as operate sophisticated machines and control technological processes, use the benefits of science and technology and solve social, cultural, ideological and other problems in accordance with socially relevant goals.

The need for a free and complete development of every individual, the establishment of man's creative talents as a decisive source of social development in the communist era will also determine its specific motive forces. These will involve man's aspiration to creative self-expression and self-realisation and the development of man's desire to cognise the world and master universal laws.

Since, as Marx pointed out, it is in a reasonable manner, rather than by means of serfdom, nobility or absurd mysticism of private ownership, that communist society re-establishes an emotional attitude to land, the fact that man also fashions matter according to the laws of beauty becomes a far from an unimportant motive force of social development under communism. This humane mission is to the great advantage of communism compared to the destruction of the environment caused by modern capitalist production.

It is only at the highest stage of development, having overcome various forms of alienation, exploitation, antagonisms, social conflicts and political revolutions, that

specific to capitalism can be served. If a capitalist can gain a profit or acquire a value from weapons production, from murder, hunger and death he is bound to do it, as his purpose and requirement is profit and surplus value.

The new source of production development also determines its corresponding motive forces. Although it has a role to play, population growth nevertheless loses its importance as a primary cause and motive force, in spite of the fact that it takes place at a higher rate. A situation becomes characteristic of capitalism when, as Marx pointed out, "it is not population that presses on productive power; it is productive power that presses on population".¹ An unchecked drive to produce and to appropriate surplus-value also results in motive forces characteristic of the specific capitalist stage of social history. Class struggle between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie, competition, etc., assume a place of priority.

Under socialism, the source and the motive forces of developing production and the entire society are radically different. While the historically established requirements mentioned above lose none of their relevance, what is eliminated is their characteristically capitalist form, i.e., private profit, or surplus-value. Under socialism, however, as production becomes specialised, as science is turned into an immediate productive force, as the division of labour becomes international, etc., requirements of the type become increasingly important. Their nature, however, is totally different, as they are based, in the final analysis, on the nature of socialism, i.e., the need to satisfy to the fullest extent the growing material and spiritual needs of all members of socialist society.

Under socialism, use-value again becomes the goal of production and a social requirement.

As capitalism is destroyed, the motive forces of social development characteristic of it also disappear. Under socialism, material and cultural requirements, the source of social

1. K. Marx, F. Engels, Collected Works, Vol. 11, Moscow, 1979, p. 531.

interested in changing the existing production relations, even if there may be a consensus that the latter must be changed. Which forces are these and why their unwillingness to accept change? As noted above, it is the form of ownership of the means of production that is the basis of production relations. The class owning the property is the dominant one; it exploits workers while getting most of the material benefits. A change in production relations means that the form of ownership is to be changed and that the dominance of the given class with all its privileges must be eliminated. Unwilling to lose its domination, it struggles for its preservation and, consequently, for the preservation of the existing production relations.

It is because of this that as productive forces develop in a class society, contradictions between the new productive forces and the production relations, which are becoming obsolete, grow increasingly acute.

Under the circumstances, the effectiveness of the utilisation of the productive forces is reduced, while the production of goods required for the dominant class tends to decrease. The dominant class, while attempting to prevent both of the tendencies, pursues the opposite aim, that of increasing its profit. Under capitalism in its present form, the drive to increase profits and superprofits not only stems from the insatiability of the monopoly bourgeoisie; it is also largely influenced by competition, since a reduction of profit of individual companies or monopolies is fraught with bankruptcies, failure or a takeover by a company which managed to acquire a higher profit. The all-out war taking place in the world of capital spurs up an unbridled profit drive.

At a time when production relations are becoming obsolete, the profit drive means more exploitation of workers, whose natural reaction is indignation, reflected in strikes, stoppages and revolutionary action in other forms. As productive forces develop, exploitation is intensified as, naturally, is the revolutionary struggle. At some stage of their development, society's material productive forces find themselves in conflict with the existing production relations, or with what is no more than their legal expression, the

mankind begins its genuine history, when free development of every man and comprehensive establishment of his abilities is a condition and a means of equally free development of all society members and of society as a whole. It is here that free labour, not perverted by exploitation and other factors, has a role to play; labour becomes the genuine source of man's unlimited development and the profound motive force behind social development.

The historical transformation of social production under the influence of the sources discussed and the motive forces discussed above is governed by the law of dialectical interaction of productive forces and production relations.

The Law of Interaction of Productive Forces and Production Relations

As already mentioned, collectives of workers come into being as a necessary condition for labour. In the process of collective labour men organise

themselves in some manner, i.e., they establish certain relations. The relations are established in the framework of society as a whole, rather than that of the collective. The relations of production established are such as to maximise the effective use of productive forces. Of necessity, the relations of production correspond to the level and nature of development of productive forces. As the productive forces develop, therefore, the production relations are transformed and restructured accordingly. As men acquire new productive forces, they change their mode of production, just as they change the production and all other economic relations which had been required under the previously existing mode of production.

A law that production relations correspond to the nature and level of productive forces is therefore in operation throughout the history of production development. Yet in a class society the law is periodically violated on a large scale. What causes the violations? Underlying them is the existence of social forces in the class society which are not

management accounting and the entire system of economic relationships.

The Role of the Environment and Population in Social Life

A determining factor of society's socio-economic, political and spiritual development, material production is based on and determined by certain na-

tural conditions, which include the environment and population. The concept of the environment denotes the part of the material world which directly influences man and his social life and which he involves, in some manner or another, in labour activity, rather than the entire Universe. It includes climate, solar radiation rates, natural rhythms (the sequences of day and night, summer and winter, etc.), the quality and quantity of water (especially fresh water), of vegetation, animals, mineral resources, surface relief, etc. Until the mid-20th century, man's attitude to the environment was based, primarily, on the belief that possibilities of the environment, as far as provision of resources and assimilation of wastes were concerned, were unlimited, and secondly, that the interrelationship among its various components was of no practical relevance for man.

At present, social production has reached a stage when internal processes and interrelationships within the natural environment have to be taken into consideration if it is to be developed further. The concept of the biosphere has evolved in science, which is taken to mean an organic interrelationship of living, bio-inert and inert matter. "The biosphere", V.I. Vernadsky stated, "is what envelops life, i.e., the domain of living matter."¹ The biosphere is the most complex system of all known to science. It became established about 3 to 4 billion years ago and is in historical evolution, while maintaining the internal balance of its components.

Man and society as a whole exist, produce and develop within the biosphere, without which their existence is impossible. Even when spacemen go far beyond the limits of the Earth's biosphere, in their spaceship a micro-biosphere is created whose destruction would mean their death.

¹. V.I. Vernadsky, Selected Works, Vol.1, Moscow, 1954, p.178 (in Russian). Living matter is the totality of bodies "of living organisms inhabiting the Earth."

relations of property, within which they were developing previously. From a form of the development of productive forces these relations become an impediment thereto. It is at this stage that the era of social revolution begins.

Revolutionary classes in struggle against exploitation and injustice are usually not aware that what they are struggling with is obsolete production relations which are no longer in accordance with new productive forces. Their goals are better living conditions, freedoms, elimination of the hated property owners, etc. Their struggle is spearheaded against the dominant class proper and the social order established by it. In actual fact, objectively the revolutionary struggle is aimed primarily at taking over the property of the previously dominant class. A takeover of the basic means of production, resulting from a social revolution, leads to changes in all the other elements of production relations.

The establishment of new production relations means that a correspondence is established with the level of development of productive forces thus attained, giving scope to the development of production as a whole.

Yet gradually a new lack of correspondence of production relations and productive forces becomes imminent, with the situation evolving towards a new social revolution, as the law of interaction of production relations and productive forces is inviolable, like any other objective universal law.

A socialist revolution transfers the means of production from one class to the entire society, rather than from a class to another, and establishes public ownership of the means of production. Thus social obstacles are eliminated which pre-action of productive forces and production relations. A socialist society is managed consciously and on the basis of objective laws of social development.

As all the productive forces undergo historical development, production relations characteristic of a socialist society are also improved; they include various forms of socialist social property (state, or public and that of collective farms and cooperatives), economic planning, commodity-money relations, distribution according to labour,

As production developed, however, society's harmful impact on the biosphere was becoming more pronounced. The process became especially rapid following the advent of machine technology, growth of industrial production and development of capitalist relations. The rising scale of transformative activity is evident from the increasing number of chemical elements involved in production. From early antiquity to the 18th century, 12 elements were in use; in the 18th century, the number was 37; in the 19th, 76; at present, all of the 89 elements existing in nature are being used, supplemented by another 18 which are man-made, and by over 1,700 isotopes (varieties of chemical elements), most of them artificial.

The volume of fresh water used for production needs is staggering; a major part of it is not returned to the environment, while the remaining part becomes polluted. The rate of global water consumption is skyrocketing, in spite of measures taken to reduce it. While in 1900, 400 cu. km. of water were consumed (including 270 cu.km. irretrievably), by 1950 the rate went up to 1,100 (out of which 650 cu. km. was irretrievable), by 1975 to 3,000 (1,800 irretrievable); by the year 2000 it is expected to reach 6,000 cu.km., 3,000 of them irretrievable.

In the course of production development, and especially as a consequence of the current scientific and technological revolution, the society, as described by Vernadsky in figurative terms, has become "a powerful geological force", comparable to natural forces of the environment. All volcanoes on earth are known to eject about 3 billion tons of substances annually in the course of their eruptions. The modern mining industry extracts annually 5 to 7 billion tons of usable minerals and 50 to 70 billion tons of waste rock, i.e., 20 times as much. Mankind burns up about 20 billion tons of oxygen, about 10 per cent of what is produced by the earth's vegetation; from 1958 to 1976, carbonic acid-concentration in the atmosphere went up 4 per cent, and is expected to rise up to 12 to 20 per cent by the year 2000. Figures could go on, yet even these are sufficient to demonstrate that in the 20th century man's activity began to have a noticeable and growing

Society's life and development consist in their action on certain elements of the biosphere, which are transformed according to its requirements. In the course of the earliest historical period, described by F. Engels as that of savagery and barbarity, the dominant socio-productive technology was a collective one; man influenced nature essentially by gathering roots, fruit and by slaughtering animals. The damage caused to the biosphere in this manner, even if temporary, was next to non-existent. Some 10 thousand years ago, major climatic changes took place on earth; to survive, men gradually developed a new socio-productive technology which entailed a transformation of and qualitative changes in elements of the biosphere. It was in the course of the same historical period that a transition from savagery and barbarity to civilisation took place, with mankind organising itself in a class society. Production was aimed at exploiting man and nature.

Over many thousands of years of development of transformative socio-productive technology, its basic principles were established - the principle of decomposition, or disintegration, of natural systems; the principle of extraction, or isolation of an object from its immediate relationship with natural systems; the principle of channelling one natural force to oppose another in accordance with man's predetermined goal; the principle of qualitative transformations of natural substances so as to adjust them to human requirements; the principle of disposal of wastes and by-products in the environment.

The principles of transformative socio-productive technology demonstrate that it is aimed at destroying interrelationships within the biosphere and disrupting the balances between its components established in the course of thousands and millions of years.

In the course of a protracted historical period, the level of development of the means of production and the energy potential used by man was such as to make the influence on the natural environment insignificant as far as the biosphere was concerned. The biosphere neutralised society's detrimental impact by reprocessing the wastes from social production.

of the biosphere are sharply reduced and pollution periodical-
ly exceeds the standards required for the maintenance of man's
health and activity; local situations of the ecological cri-
sis type, when the destruction of individual components of
the biosphere in various geographical regions exceeds their
biospheric reproduction; local ecological crisis, when the
situations of the ecological crisis encompass all the basic
components of the biosphere required for human life and acti-
vity in a geographical region; the formation of local eco-
logical crises in several regions of the globe signifies the
beginning of a global ecological crisis. This is the last
stage when mankind is still capable of saving the biosphere
and consequently the natural basis of its life, although its
sacrifices at all the preceding stages will be incalculable.
The global ecological crisis begins when the destruction of
biospheric components and their balances and relationships
takes place in man's most important habitats on earth and
exceeds their reproduction by the biosphere over a period lon-
ger than a third of human life, i.e., a succession of genera-
tions.

Studies of the prevailing situation in society-nature
relationship demonstrate that in many geographical regions
there is currently a threat of a local ecological crisis;
in some, the crisis is beginning, while in other regions the
situation of an ecological crisis already exists. This refers
primarily to major industrial centres in capitalist countries
and even to entire countries. The USA is known to provide less
than 60 per cent of oxygen consumed by that country. With less
than 6 per cent of the world's population, the USA accounts
for 40 per cent of annual global consumption of natural resou-
rces and for over 40 per cent of pollutants discharged in the
biosphere. Even a country like Switzerland uses up 39.3 milli-
on tons of oxygen annually, while vegetation on its territory
produces only 9.5 million tons of it, which means that it is
only 25 per cent self-sufficient in oxygen. A similar situati-
on prevails in other developed capitalist countries. For pro-
duction, they use up oxygen produced in territories of other
countries.

Thus, what can be described as ecological exploitation

influence on the biosphere, and to disrupt the relationships between its components. Over the last 100 years plant and animal biomass on land has been reduced by 7 per cent, while the productiveness of the earth's living environment fell by almost 20 per cent. Some 25,000 species of plants, i.e., about 10 per cent of the total number of higher plant species, and about 30 per cent of animals are endangered species; rapid desertification is taking place at the rate of 10 hectares per minute; over the first half of the 20th century the area of arable lands was reduced by 50 per cent, while in the 1970s the average rate of loss was 5.8 million hectares per year.

The damage to the biosphere results in growing difficulties in social production, reflected in resource shortages, growing prices of raw materials, etc. As an integrated indicator, growing expenditures of energy per unit of output can be used; from the early century until the mid-1970s the expenditures increased 8 to 10 times in agriculture and 10 to 12 times in industry.

The damage to the environment inflicted by production, through the intermediary of numerous factors as well as directly, influences man, his health and human life itself: the incidence of cancer, cardiovascular, nervous, mental and other diseases grows, as does the number of newborn children with inherited incurable diseases.

Thus, an unfavourable situation is evolving in the relationship of society with the biosphere, described as the eco-local crisis.

The ecological crisis is a philosophical and socio-logical category denoting a situation in the relationship of society and the natural environment when destruction by social production of the biosphere's components, balances and relations reaches a stage when it begins to undermine the natural basis of man's life and to endanger man's existence. Depending on the degree of damage to the biosphere, the stages of the ecological crisis can be as follows: threat of a crisis, when tendencies towards destruction of the biosphere are clearly evident in the society-environment relationship; beginning of the ecological crisis, when individual components

sections of the working class, intelligentsia, office employees, craftsmen and petty traders, petty and even middle bourgeoisie. The big monopoly bourgeoisie and the dominant political parties in capitalist states seek to win this mass movement over to their side, to master it and to channel it in the direction of bourgeois-democratic processes.

Communists seek to gain the support of the movement, to introduce into it a scientific environmental consciousness and an understanding of the social nature of the ecological problem; they seek to make it clear that it is the dominance of monopolies, capitalist production relations and the pursuit of maximum profit that make the ecological problem increasingly acute. Communists seek to make this movement anti-imperialist, while helping popular masses make an important step from merely protesting against the results of capitalist economic activity, which are detrimental to the environment, to rejecting capitalism as a system hostile to both nature and man.

In the process, Communists have to face the rather difficult task of finding a common ideological basis for the most diverse social strata participating in the environmental movement.

The common basis is, primarily, action to preserve peace, in favour of detente, against the arms race and for disarmament. Militarisation is known to be one of the major factors damaging the environment, with its consumption of enormous resources, various harmful wastes, leaks of poisonous gases, radioactivity, military bases, weapons tests, and military exercises, all of which destroy the environment, harm the health and endanger the very life of man, irrespectively of which social stratum one belongs to.

There is one more environmental aspect to the struggle for peace and disarmament. Currently over 500 billion dollars are spent on armaments annually, with one out of four scientists in the world engaged in improving military hardware, while 50 per cent of the funds earmarked for scientific research are channelled to the arms race and 50 million skilled workers are employed in the war industry. If weapons reductions were to be tackled successfully, the enormous

of the world's biosphere by capitalist countries is taking place. With less than 20 per cent of the world population, they discharge over 65 per cent of pollutants into the world's biosphere.

It is the working masses that suffer the most from pollution in the capitalist countries, as they actually have to work at enterprises, their dwellings are usually situated in regions which are ecologically disadvantageous, they have no means of resorting to personal protection from pollution (air conditioners, etc.), they have inadequate recreation facilities, etc. Because of this, workers are increasingly active in demanding protection of the environment, building of waste disposal facilities and reducing pollution.

The working class has never failed to include ecological demands in its class struggle. The environmental aspect has found its expression in demands for labour safety, for better working, living, leisure and health facilities. Nowadays meeting these demands becomes increasingly urgent, while the working class and its parties have to face treacherous tactics of monopolies aimed at splitting the ranks of the working class, which have various forms: in response to workers' demands that environment protection funds be increased the companies blackmail the workers, threatening termination of employment due to reduced profits or the need to close down the enterprises; by threats of closing down, the companies provoke action by workers of cooperating enterprises against those who had advanced ecological demands; when there are other reasons for closing down, e.g., the enterprises are not profitable or failing, the companies still attribute it to ecological demands, thus splitting the ranks of workers; by threats of dismissal or closing down, the companies provoke workers' action against bills on environmental protection, etc.

Thus, explaining to workers of various enterprises that they have common goals and interests vis-à-vis environmental protection and uniting them in struggle against monopolies are important tasks Communists face.

A specific feature of the mass movement to protect the environment is its multi-dimensional nature, and heterogeneity from the social and class standpoint. It involves various

the other hand, Communists should avoid creating the impression that the solution of ecological problems should be postponed until socialist transformations of socio-economic life can take place. Protection of the environment is a modern form of class struggle, using which the working class can attain much, while still remaining within the framework of capitalist society. The working masses can force the monopolies to increase the portion of their profits used to build waste disposal facilities, to develop and utilise recycling technological processes, to improve the quality of water in rivers, lakes and other reservoirs, to combat soil erosion, to preserve plant and animal life, to create safe protection systems for atomic power stations.

Over the recent years, a broad movement to protect the environment against the hazards related to atomic power stations has gained momentum in a number of capitalist countries. At the same time owners of oil monopolies were skilfully making use of the insufficiently informed man-in-the-street to channel the movement against the development of nuclear energy, which, they claim, is dangerous by itself. What the oil companies were actually doing was pursuing their own goals in the struggle with the companies who invest in nuclear energy. An atomic power station presents no danger if protected properly. The protection is a costly process, and the companies keep their expenditures to a minimum. The ecological movement should demand that companies building atomic power stations install sufficiently reliable safeguards and earmark sufficient funds for the purpose.

Bowing to the pressure of ecological demands by the working masses, many of the capitalist countries have adopted laws on environmental protection; what these boil down to is mostly fines, taxes and compensation payable by the polluting company. Yet the measures can never be effective under capitalism, as the companies are merely charged for polluting, while nothing is being done to prevent it. Besides, the companies still have the option of refunding the fines by stepping up exploitation and raising the prices of their output.

A way of solving the ecological problem capitalist-style is environmental colonisation of developing countries.

financial, material and human resources thus released could be channelled to solving the ecological problem and other problems of vital importance facing mankind.

To mislead the working masses and to split their ranks and to protect the military-industrial complex, bourgeois propaganda claims that if military production is stopped, workers will lose their jobs and unemployment will go up. What it fails to mention, though, is that progressive scientists have already worked out the conception of reconversion of war industry to non-military production. Ideologists of the military-industrial complex also write that military preparations provide more employment than non-military production. Yet studies demonstrate something totally different. According to data for 1970-1974, 1 billion dollars create 45,000 to 58,000 jobs in the military field and 59,000 to 88,000 jobs, i.e., 14 to 30 thousand more, in the civilian sector.

Another common basis is promotion of cooperation among peoples and states in the solution of ecological problems, as these can be solved only through common efforts by all nations.

Another idea which serves as a basis for unity is natural concern for human health, now increasingly threatened by pollution.

A specific feature of the ecological problem is its urgency both at present and in the future. When consumed by man, radioactivity and poisonous chemicals and substances accumulate in the human body, to be transmitted to the posterity. Today's pollution will thus affect our children, grandchildren and great-grandchildren. Preserving our children's future and health of the next generation is thus a common concern for all sections of society participating in the ecological movement.

Active participation by the working class and Communists introduces a class and political content in the mass movement to protect environment. With this in mind, Communists, on the one hand, have to demonstrate that the capitalist system, the dominance of monopolies and the pursuit of private profit are the most basic cause of ecological problems. On

An integrated approach to the solution of ecological problems means that the socialist state, relying on public ownership of the means of production and on natural wealth, elaborates and takes measures to protect the environment which involve vast economic and geographical regions, where all industrial enterprises and elements of the environment, such as soils, reservoirs, vegetation, living organisms, atmospheric processes, climate, etc., are treated as a single system.

As opposed to capitalist production, where the goal is maximum profit, socialist production is aimed at meeting man's material and spiritual requirements; its object is man and comprehensive development of the human person. As a result, a socialist society approaches production development wisely, taking into account, in a comprehensive manner, the interests both of the society as a whole and of every individual.

If a production process has too great a negative impact on nature and the latter cannot be protected at the present level of development of science and technology, the development of such a production process is delayed in the interests of the present and future generations. In accordance with a decision taken by the Government of the USSR, the State Committee on Environmental Protection has the right to close down old enterprises of this type and to veto the building of new ones. In the USSR, all power, both national and local, is vested in the people, or in the Soviets of People's Deputies, which means that the solution of the ecological problem, protection of the environment and creation of favourable living conditions for working people are always controlled by the people.

Under socialism, the Communist Party is the guiding and leading social force; on the basis of Marxist-Leninist theory, it determines the long-term policy of social development, directs all creative activity; it exists for the people and serves the people.

Under socialism there is no social force which would have interests running counter to those of the people. All so-

It consists in exports by capitalist countries of their polluting enterprises to developing countries, where environmental legislation is not effective or totally lacking. Owners of the enterprises are free of fines, they do not spend on waste disposal facilities; they also have cheap labour, sources of raw materials and cheap land to build new enterprises on. They thus leave their pollutants in the developing countries while exporting net profit to the capitalist ones.

Environmental colonisation also has other forms, like purchases of raw materials at low prices, mining for minerals in territories of developing countries by capitalist monopolies which fail to take any measures to protect the environment, including the terrain, soils, vegetation, animal life, etc.; exports of products banned in capitalist countries (various pesticides, equipment lacking disposal facilities, sales of licenses for production processes not yet tested from the point of view of their impact on the environment, etc.); conducting various experiments endangering the environment, etc.

A socialist revolution and the building of a new society do not automatically solve the ecological problem; neither do they eliminate from the agenda the task of protecting the environment. Still, socialism creates all the conditions required for harmonious relations between society and nature, for a scientific solution to problems arising in relations between man and the environment.

Socialism has some enormous advantages as far as the solution of ecological problems is concerned. Among these is the planned nature of social production, which means that in planning economic development, building new plants, factories, power stations, etc., the socialist state takes into account the need for protecting the natural environment, for recycling technological processes, for waste disposal facilities, for training the necessary personnel, etc. It also means that it is on a systematic and planned basis that the socialist state restructures old enterprises to take into account environmental concerns, and that it takes measures to protect the environment from harmful waste products of industrial processes.

goal of survival and procreation of the species. Had it not been for the latter, over a brief historical period the biomass of men would have surpassed that of the earth.

While meeting their vital requirements, men develop productive forces, or the production of material goods, which leads to new requirements, serving, in their turn, as incentives for further economic development. The developing production creates prerequisites for the development of population, for its quantitative growth and qualitative change: the higher the rate of economic development, the more rapid the population growth. By the end of the Paleolith (approx. 15 thousand years B.C.), population is estimated to have reached 3 million, by the end of the Mesolith (7 thousand years B.C.), 10 million, and by the end of the Neolith (2 thousand years B.C.), 50 million. At the beginning of this age, the population of the earth was about 230 million. In the course of the Mesolith, population was growing at the rate of approximately 15 per cent millennium; in the Neolith, with the advent of cattle breeding and agriculture, the population growth rate went up sharply, as population was growing at the rate of 40 per cent per one thousand years; over the last 2 thousand years B.C. it became 4.5 times as numerous. In the first millennium A.D. further population growth came in conflict with the low level of the development of productive forces, and in the course of the millennium population only increased by 20 per cent. By the beginning of the second millennium A.D., the earth's population was 275 million; by the year 1500 it grew to 450 million, an increase of 64 per cent over 500 years. In the course of three and a quarter centuries, from 1650 to 1975, the world's population became seven times as numerous as before; the first time the number doubled required almost 200 years, the second less than one hundred, while the latest took place in no more than 50 years, in spite of World War II. At the current rate of growth, the earth's population may double in about 35 years. The UN estimates that by the year 2000 the population will reach 6 to 7 billion. In 1981, over 4.5 billion men lived on earth.

The rapid growth of population is attributable to the development of society's productive forces, a reduction in

cial production and natural resources are managed by the people, which solves all problems, including the ecological one, in the interests of this and the future generations. As a theory and social practice, communism has one more mission of world-historic importance, that of saving mankind from the threat of a global ecological crisis and of establishing a harmonious relationship between society and nature.

Demographic Problems

Apart from natural factors and biospheric conditions,

population, its numerical

strength and density over a given territory, is a prerequisite for man's existence and development.

Population is a philosophical and sociological category used to denote the totality of men whose life and activity take place on a given territory, circumscribed by some limits (e.g., of a state, economic, geographical and other nature). The concept of population should be distinguished from those of a populace and a society. The concept of populace mainly denotes the number of men inhabiting a territory. The concept of society primarily reflects the essential relationships which unite men in a community, i.e., economic, political and ideological relations. Population denotes the quantity and quality of a populace which are essential for social life. It includes population quantity in general, age distribution (the number of children, women, men, the young and the old), class composition, occupation (e.g., manual workers, intellectuals, students, etc.), skill level, the number of those sick and the duration of the illness, etc.

Besides the statistical qualitative and quantitative description of a populace, the concept of population also includes its historical change and development. Birth rate in a populace and its quantitative growth are related to man's biological nature, to specific environmental conditions in a habitat, to tradition and even religious beliefs. Population develops under the influence of the contradiction between, on the one hand, a natural desire to survive and procreate, inherent in all living organisms, and, on the other hand, real conditions of and means for attaining this

relations are needed. It was F. Engels who pointed this out: "There is, of course, the abstract possibility that the human population will become so numerous that its further increase will have to be checked. If it should become necessary for communist society to regulate the production of men, just as it will have already regulated the production of things, then it, and it alone, will be able to do this without difficulties."¹

"The production of men" and "the production of things" are organically interrelated; the relationship is reflected in economic population laws, which express the dynamics of the work force and the degree and nature of its utilisation. Under capitalism, as production develops and the capital created by workers' labour is being accumulated, there is a discrepancy between the growth of labour force and the rate of its utilisation; this results in redundant labour. "The labouring population," Marx wrote, "therefore produces, along with the accumulation of capital produced by it, the means by which it itself is made relatively superfluous.... This is a law of population peculiar to the capitalist mode of production."² The capitalist overpopulation has various forms, e.g., a temporary one, a latent one, a chronic one, etc. In the general crisis of capitalism, unemployment, a reflection of relative overpopulation, becomes mass and persistent.

Under socialism, the population law is effective, based on the principle of scientifically substantiated management of the quantity and quality of the population in accordance with society's material and spiritual requirements, the level and nature of the development of social production and real possibilities of sustaining a harmonious relationship with the natural environment. The law establishes a cause-and-effect relationship between, on the one hand, the growth of social wealth, and on the other, full employment and rational involvement of all population capable of socially useful labour.

1. KMarx, EEngels, Selected Correspondence, Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1975, p. 315.

2. Karl Marx, Capital, Vol. I, pp. 591-592.

mortality rates and an increase in average life expectancy in countries no longer under colonial or semi-colonial oppression, which account for 80 per cent of all population growth. While as recently as in the 19th century average life expectancy in Europe was 35 years, the figure now is 68 to 70 for North America and Europe, 56 for Latin America and 40 for Africa.

Besides the development of production, population growth is also based on other specific historical factors which play quite a substantial role in specific historical periods. Some examples are the death of about 15 million in a 14th-century plague epidemic, of about 20 million in a Spanish flu epidemic following World War I, of 25 million dying of hunger in the 19th century in India and of an even greater number in China. The losses in two world wars totalled some 70 million men. Population growth (and specifically the number of children per family) is strongly influenced by tradition, morals and customs. In developed countries, the woman's social standing and cultural requirements of the population have an important role to play. In developed countries birth rates are going down as women become involved, on a broad scale, in social life; their educational and cultural level is going up, and is the marriageable age, on the one hand, while, on the other, young parents have to face a lack of nurseries and kindergartens and material difficulties.

In most countries of the world, various measures are currently being taken to regulate population growth; in many European countries incentives are established for population growth, while in some countries which are now free from colonial dependence, measures are being taken to limit the growth.

The earth's population growth cannot be unlimited, as humanity has been and remains a part of the biosphere, and the domain of its life is limited by the laws of the latter, the violation of which will mean the destruction of man's natural habitat. The task of consciously managing all population development, both in individual countries and regions and on a global scale, is becoming increasingly urgent. Yet, if the problem is to be solved successfully, adequate social

Material relations are production relations among men, relations between society and nature, everyday relations among men, etc.; these are established as a result, or a form, of man's activity. They are material in that they are objective, independent of man's will and desire, and are primary, i.e., they determine all the other relations. Production relations are the most basic relations of all the material relations.

Ideological relations are social relations based on social consciousness and reflected in the spiritual life of men. The nucleus of these are political, legal, ethical, aesthetic and other types of relations. They are formed through upbringing, education, and the mass media. Ideological relations materialise in activities of various social organisations and institutions, which serve as conduits of ideas, attitudes, social feelings, outlooks, theories, conceptions and doctrines.

The two groups of social relations, which characterise social being and social consciousness, are related to two basic structural elements of society, the basis and the superstructure. Production relations constitute the basis of society, while ideological relations and political, legal and other ideas with their corresponding organisations and institutions represent the superstructure of society.

The superstructure is secondary vis-à-vis the basis in the following sense: in the first place, the content of the entire superstructure is determined by the basis, and secondly, in the course of historical development changes in the superstructure follow those in the basis and take place under the influence of the latter.

At the same time, the superstructure is relatively independent, this being expressed in such properties as the existence of its own laws of development; historical continuity of the forms of existence of ideas, theories, doctrines, and organisations and institutions; the fact that superstructural phenomena lag behind the basis processes or overtake them; the influence of the superstructure upon the development of the basis and the course of social development as a whole.

The dialectico-materialist conception of social development has nothing in common with the fatalistic interpretation

Under socialism, society guarantees a job for every able-bodied individual, in accordance with one's vocation, educational and professional level and taking into account social requirements. A rational utilisation of the able-bodied population involves a correct and economically substantiated distribution of labour force among enterprises, economic branches and regions, and personnel training and skill upgrading on a planned basis.

Thus, society cannot exist and develop outside the environment, without using its forces and substances, just as no society is thinkable lacking a certain population level. Yet it is neither the natural environment nor the population growth that serve as the basic causes determining the nature of a social system, its development and transition from one historical stage to another. The degree of influence of the environment on society and the population growth, in their turn, depend on production relations and on society's economic system.

The entire course of world history, its long-term orientation, the transition from one historical stage to another and the ascent of mankind to new levels are all based on the development of production.

4. The Universal Historical Law of the Progressive Succession of Socio-Economic Formations

The Basis and Super-structure As a totality of historically established forms of common activities of men, society is characterised by a variety of diverse relations between individual men, man and society, various social groups, strata and classes. Among the diverse social relations are economic, political, socio-psychological, ethical ones, etc. "The basic idea /of Marx's teaching/," Lenin pointed out, "was that social relations are divided into material and ideological. The latter merely constitute a superstructure on the former."¹

1. V.I. Lenin, Collected Works, Vol. 1, p. 151.

elements generated by the very development of social formations.

Each socio-economic formation is a live, ever developing social organism, an integral social system, a concrete historical unity of the basis and the superstructure.

How do the basis and the superstructure interrelate? It was stated above that the basis generates the superstructure and is the foundation of its existence, that the replacement of the economic basis brings about a change in the whole superstructural system. The replacement of the basis of the primitive-communal, tribal system by the slave-owning system brought about superstructural phenomena previously non-existent: the state, politics, law, philosophy, effected a class reconstruction of morals and the arts.

The basis and the superstructure also undergo evolutionary change within the framework of a given social system and reflect the various stages of its development. Thus, the basis of capitalist society has undergone two stages of social development: pre-monopolistic and monopolistic.

Here we speak of the interaction of the basis as the economic structure of society and the superstructure as the sphere of controlling the functions and the development of the structure. Hence the superstructure in its turn actively influences the basis. In the periods of progressive development of a certain social system the superstructure serves to strengthen and develop its economic basis. In the periods of disintegration of certain production relations the superstructure bears a reactionary character, hinders the development of the economic basis, and this brings about stagnation and general crisis in the economy and all spheres of social life. In certain historical conditions the superstructure may facilitate economic development, in other conditions it may impede it.

A correct understanding of the interaction of economics and politics helps the Marxist-Leninist parties to scientifically forecast and plan their strategy of the revolutionary struggle and the building of socialism.

The Concept of Types
of Socio-Economic

By discovering the objective laws of social development the founders

on of social life, which limits the importance of ideal stimulating motives in historical activity, the role of politics, ideology, social doctrines in social progress. Engels pointed to the dialectic of interaction of the basis and the superstructure, various forms of ideology -- politics, law, philosophy, religion, art - which results in the formation of the historical process. "... Although the material mode of existence is the primum agens primary cause," he said, "this does not prevent the ideological spheres from reacting upon it and influencing it in their turn."¹

Social, political and ideological institutions, being component parts of the superstructure, also have material force directly contained in their organisations and institutions -- the state, political parties, religious organisations, cultural and educational establishments. The state, for instance, wields such material instruments of power as the army, police, prisons, etc. with the help of which it executes its functions and directs social life according to the interests and will of the ruling class.

In the societies where the material foundation is the system of relations of private property, the economic basis engenders antagonistic classes with mutually excluding interests. The class antagonism generated by the economic basis is reflected in consciousness, superstructural phenomena and relations. The exploiting classes use the superstructure to strengthen the economic basis of the respective socio-economic formation and their dominating position in the society. The oppressed, exploited classes form in the sphere of the superstructure the institutions which express their own interests and serve as instruments of liberation class struggle (i.e. political parties, trade unions and similar social organisations); they elaborate their own world-views, moral and legal points of view, elements of culture. These superstructural institutions become instrumental to a revolution, the creation of a new economic basis, the formation of a superstructure corresponding to a new socio-economic formation. They are the

1. K. Marx, F. Engels, Selected Correspondence, p. 393.

elements generated by the very development of social formations.

Each socio-economic formation is a live, ever developing social organism, an integral social system, a concrete historical unity of the basis and the superstructure.

How do the basis and the superstructure interrelate? It was stated above that the basis generates the superstructure and is the foundation of its existence, that the replacement of the economic basis brings about a change in the whole superstructural system. The replacement of the basis of the primitive-communal, tribal system by the slave-owning system brought about superstructural phenomena previously non-existent: the state, politics, law, philosophy, effected a class reconstruction of morals and the arts.

The basis and the superstructure also undergo evolutionary change within the framework of a given social system and reflect the various stages of its development. Thus, the basis of capitalist society has undergone two stages of social development: pre-monopolistic and monopolistic.

Here we speak of the interaction of the basis as the economic structure of society and the superstructure as the sphere of controlling the functions and the development of the structure. Hence the superstructure in its turn actively influences the basis. In the periods of progressive development of a certain social system the superstructure serves to strengthen and develop its economic basis. In the periods of disintegration of certain production relations the superstructure bears a reactionary character, hinders the development of the economic basis, and this brings about stagnation and general crisis in the economy and all spheres of social life. In certain historical conditions the superstructure may facilitate economic development, in other conditions it may impede it.

A correct understanding of the interaction of economics and politics helps the Marxist-Leninist parties to scientifically forecast and plan their strategy of the revolutionary struggle and the building of socialism.

The Concept of Types
of Socio-Economic

By discovering the objective laws of social development the founders

of Marxism-Leninism have put an end to abstract speculations about society in general, about progress in general.

general, and for the first time turned to the study of society as a historically specific organism. "...To begin by asking what is society and what is progress, is to begin at the end," Lenin wrote about the scientific approach to the understanding of social life. "Where will you get a concept of society and progress in general if you have not studied a single social formation in particular, if you have not even been able to establish this concept, if you have not even been able to approach a serious factual investigation, an objective analysis of social relations of any kind."¹

It is impossible to find two completely similar social organisms in the history of mankind. The Kingdom of Egypt, the State of Houraty, Athens, Sparta -- each of these ancient societies had its specific features which made it different from the rest. The same concerns still to a greater extent the modern societies which exist within the framework of 160 independent states. Unique histories of various societies were already noted by pre-Marxian historians. It was impossible to overcome the chaos and arbitrariness which reigned in views on history and create a true sociological science without uncovering common features between different social systems, without determining repetitions in their development.

What are these common features and repetitions? They are production and socio-economic relations. Production relations in any concrete society form a more or less integrated system, and this is the basic determinant which unites different societies of the same type. As production relations are fundamental and determinative, the societies which have as their basis the same system of socio-economic relations, notwithstanding their differences, are essentially the same kind of society and belong to the same type of it. On the other hand, social organisms with different economic structures, whatever similarities they may have, are deeply different in their essence and belong to different types of society.

¹. V.I. Lenin, Collected Works, Vol. 1, pp. 143-144.

Thus, by taking production relations for the basis of any society and uncovering the existence of qualitative differences between them, the multitude of social organisms was reduced to several basic types, which were called socio-economic formations. "...The analysis of material social relations," Lenin wrote, "at once made it possible to observe recurrence and regularity and to generalise the systems of the various countries in the single fundamental concept: social formation."¹

The socio-economic formation is a specific historical type of society representing the social system determined by production relations.

The concept of socio-economic formation in the materialist understanding of history makes it possible to distinguish one period of history from another, and instead of speculating on "society in general" to examine real social life by singling out production relations (or the economic structure of society) as being the most important and primary ones. The concept of socio-economic formation makes it possible to combine, or compare various countries undergoing the same stages of the development of material production and to uncover their common features. Unlike the eclectical social theories which look upon society as a mechanical totality of social institutions, organisations and groups (the family, state, church, etc.), and upon the historical process as merely a result of the influence of various factors (the geographical environment, national character, personality, etc.), the concept of socio-economic formation makes it possible to study human society at every concrete stage of its development as an integral social organism which includes all social phenomena in their unity and interaction.

While determining the concept of socio-economic formation, Lenin called it "a specific social organism, whose inception, functioning, and transition to a higher form, conversion into another social organism, are governed by specific laws."²

1. V.I. Lenin, Collected Works, Vol. 1, p. 140.

2. Ibid., p. 410.

Proceeding from this, one can point out two aspects in the study of the problem of socio-economic formation. The first is the typological one, when social relations in a society are being examined at a given stage of its development as stable ones, characteristic for the given formation. By using this very aspect objective laws of the functioning of the given society are being ascertained. The second one is the genetic aspect which determines the stages of development of a certain type of formation, from its making up to its disappearance. So the genetic analysis of the capitalist socio-economic formation warrants the conclusion that this formation, as any other precapitalist one, undergoes in its development a number of stages, from under-developed forms to its maturity and then to decay and the creation of prerequisites for passing over to a higher level of social development.

The basis of the formation is the production relations. They are of decisive importance for the emergence and development of any socio-economic formation, they determine the basic social, political and spiritual processes taking place in a given society. Alongside with the basic, dominant relations there can still exist in a society the elements of the socio-economic relations of the previous formations as well as newly developing relations of the further formation which are of subordinate importance. These relations being leftovers of the past or the rudiments of the future, represent structures. At different development stages of a socio-economic formation the structures play different roles. In some cases they deform the socio-economic system and hold back the development of society, in other cases they strain social conflicts and accelerate their settlement.

The discovery of the socio-economic formation as an integrated social organism, social system, functioning and developing according to its own specific laws and on the basis of the given production relations, has brought about a revolution in the theory of social history, of the character and the trend, major direction of world history. Is there a certain order, objective law common for the development of mankind in

Proceeding from this, one can point out two aspects in the study of the problem of socio-economic formation. The first is the typological one, when social relations in a society are being examined at a given stage of its development as stable ones, characteristic for the given formation. By using this very aspect objective laws of the functioning of the given society are being ascertained. The second one is the genetic aspect which determines the stages of development of a certain type of formation, from its making up to its disappearance. So the genetic analysis of the capitalist socio-economic formation warrants the conclusion that this formation, as any other precapitalist one, undergoes in its development a number of stages, from under-developed forms to its maturity and then to decay and the creation of prerequisites for passing over to a higher level of social development.

The basis of the formation is the production relations. They are of decisive importance for the emergence and development of any socio-economic formation, they determine the basic social, political and spiritual processes taking place in a given society. Alongside with the basic, dominant relations there can still exist in a society the elements of the socio-economic relations of the previous formations as well as newly developing relations of the further formation which are of subordinate importance. These relations being leftovers of the past or the rudiments of the future, represent structures. At different development stages of a socio-economic formation the structures play different roles. In some cases they deform the socio-economic system and hold back the development of society, in other cases they strain social conflicts and accelerate their settlement.

The discovery of the socio-economic formation as an integrated social organism, social system, functioning and developing according to its own specific laws and on the basis of the given production relations, has brought about a revolution in the theory of social history, of the character and the trend, major direction of world history. Is there a certain order, objective law common for the development of mankind in

concrete run of social development but also of explaining it, of working out a scientific typology for the world historical process. Historical science has received the method with the help of which one can find the way out of the maze of inexplicable chance occurrences and the apparent chaos of facts and events of which history is comprised. The uncovering of the fact that in the history of mankind there are certain major stages embracing great spans of time made it possible to bring together the diversity of directions, ways and tendencies in the development of different nations into a single historical line of mankind's progress from lower stages to the higher ones.

Each nation wherever it lives and whatever colour of skin it has, has to create productive forces and enter into certain production relations to satisfy its vital needs. In the course of production development people change the whole system of their life, all social relations out of necessity, and by doing this they go over to a higher historical stage, to a new formation. National, geographical and other features of the given nation add certain specific features to this or that formation, but in its essence the historical stages of development are common for all nations.

Why is it so? Because in their productive forces all nations, all people lean upon the same natural laws and, consequently, create similar productive forces. The historical sequence in the development of productive forces is based on the necessary sequence of mastering the forces of nature, on the common objective laws of the productive forces' development. While mastering ever more profound natural laws, people create ever more complex means of labour which always and everywhere to a certain extent are similar due to the similarity of the laws of nature. And comparably similar productive forces bring about similar production relations. Due to this all nations build up basically similar socio-economic formations.

Under the impact of the common historical direction in the development of productive forces mankind of necessity creates consecutively one type of production relations after another, which determine the corresponding types of formations. And no nation, even united by a common will, can channel

concrete run of social development but also of explaining it, of working out a scientific typology for the world historical process. Historical science has received the method with the help of which one can find the way out of the maze of inexplicable chance occurrences and the apparent chaos of facts and events of which history is comprised. The uncovering of the fact that in the history of mankind there are certain major stages embracing great spans of time made it possible to bring together the diversity of directions, ways and tendencies in the development of different nations into a single historical line of mankind's progress from lower stages to the higher ones.

Each nation wherever it lives and whatever colour of skin it has, has to create productive forces and enter into certain production relations to satisfy its vital needs. In the course of production development people change the whole system of their life, all social relations out of necessity, and by doing this they go over to a higher historical stage, to a new formation. National, geographical and other features of the given nation add certain specific features to this or that formation, but in its essence the historical stages of development are common for all nations.

Why is it so? Because in their productive forces all nations, all people lean upon the same natural laws and, consequently, create similar productive forces. The historical sequence in the development of productive forces is based on the necessary sequence of mastering the forces of nature, on the common objective laws of the productive forces' development. While mastering ever more profound natural laws, people create ever more complex means of labour which always and everywhere to a certain extent are similar due to the similarity of the laws of nature. And comparably similar productive forces bring about similar production relations. Due to this all nations build up basically similar socio-economic formations.

Under the impact of the common historical direction in the development of productive forces mankind of necessity creates consecutively one type of production relations after another, which determine the corresponding types of formations. And no nation, even united by a common will, can channel

concrete run of social development but also of explaining it, of working out a scientific typology for the world historical process. Historical science has received the method with the help of which one can find the way out of the maze of inexplicable chance occurrences and the apparent chaos of facts and events of which history is comprised. The uncovering of the fact that in the history of mankind there are certain major stages embracing great spans of time made it possible to bring together the diversity of directions, ways and tendencies in the development of different nations into a single historical line of mankind's progress from lower stages to the higher ones.

Each nation wherever it lives and whatever colour of skin it has, has to create productive forces and enter into certain production relations to satisfy its vital needs. In the course of production development people change the whole system of their life, all social relations out of necessity, and by doing this they go over to a higher historical stage, to a new formation. National, geographical and other features of the given nation add certain specific features to this or that formation, but in its essence the historical stages of development are common for all nations.

Why is it so? Because in their productive forces all nations, all people lean upon the same natural laws and, consequently, create similar productive forces. The historical sequence in the development of productive forces is based on the necessary sequence of mastering the forces of nature, on the common objective laws of the productive forces' development. While mastering ever more profound natural laws, people create ever more complex means of labour which always and everywhere to a certain extent are similar due to the similarity of the laws of nature. And comparably similar productive forces bring about similar production relations. Due to this all nations build up basically similar socio-economic formations.

Under the impact of the common historical direction in the development of productive forces mankind of necessity creates consecutively one type of production relations after another, which determine the corresponding types of formations. And no nation, even united by a common will, can channel

its development in a direction utterly different from the universal one. To skip over a formation bypassing the next one which is historically determined is possible for a nation or a state only if another nation, being at a much higher stage of development, helps to create the necessary productive forces alongside with production relations.

Whatever diversity makes one nation different from another, mankind as a whole obeys one common universal historical law: progressive replacement of socio-economic formations is the necessary course of the world historical process stipulated by the developing production of material benefits.

Theoretical examination of the global historical process presupposes an analysis of principally most general and typical features in the development of mankind with obligatory consideration of the specific conditions under which a given nation develops. A dogmatic application of the law and the theory of formations in general can harm science. One has also to bear it in mind that there are no "pure" formations in history. Historical development is uneven and asynchronous. Any formation includes the elements of the past and future formations. The fact that there are no chronologically exact divisions between the formations is also due to the above said. When speaking of transitions from one formation to another, we have to remember that only major, general characteristics are meant, because there are no abstract, strict boundaries between the society's historical epochs as well as between the world's historical epochs. There are always transitional periods in history, but they do not prevent us from distinguishing qualitative stages in the world historical process.

Major Stages of Human Development

Mankind has gone through four formations: the primitive-communal, slave-owning, feudal and capitalist ones.

At present mankind is going through the epoch of transition to communism, socialism being its first phase.

The primitive-communal formation was historically the first and most primitive form of human organisation. Productive forces were extremely weak, the products produced were barely sufficient for human existence. People were united

largely according to blood relations. Means of production were socially owned - common land, instruments, shelter. Distribution was conducted according to the principle of equal share. Human relations were based upon mutual help and collectivism. Analysing the historical process of the establishment of human society, Engels singled out three major epochs: savagery, barbarism and civilisation.¹ In the epoch of savagery people used mainly ready objects of nature to satisfy their vital needs. Various man-made products - instruments of labour - served as auxiliary means of such appropriation.

The epoch of barbarism was a higher level of human development. People took to cattle breeding, land cultivation and from simple collection of ready natural products went over to the production of things necessary for the satisfaction of their needs. Instruments of labour began to play a major role in the maintenance and development of human society. The transition of mankind from the collection of natural products to the production of products is called in science the neolithic revolution. The latter brought about major changes in all spheres of life of society due to the fact that cattle-breeding and land cultivation became the basis of economy; settled life took roots, permanent settlements grew in number, metal implements of labour became widespread, labour productivity grew rapidly, social wealth multiplied. There appeared surpluses of products which could be exchanged. The exchange stimulated the growth of production. Thus, the transition from barbarism to civilisation took place.

The growth of labour productivity was responsible for the fact that it became more profitable to live in families. The clan community broke up into families. There appeared private property and the family became the owner of means of production. However these means of production concentrated mainly in the families of the former tribal aristocracy. The appearance of private property brought about the division of primitive society into classes; the primitive social

1. K. Marx and F. Engels, Selected Works in three volumes, Vol. 3, p. 204.

formation broke up, there came slave-owning formation instead of it. Production relations were brought into conformity with new productive forces which had been developing throughout several dozens of millennia. Thus mankind went over from barbarism to civilisation, the period of the far greater degree of development of agriculture, industry, intricate labour instruments, machinery, trade, art, science, wide socio-political activity of the masses.

The slave-owning formation has become the first class society. The productive forces inherited from the primitive formation continued to develop rapidly. Wood and stone instruments once and for all gave way to metal instruments. Alongside with cereal cultivation there appeared horticulture and market-gardening, irrigation structures and grain processing mills. There developed mining and building, military technology, ship-building, various crafts.

The development of the productive forces in the conditions of slave ownership took place within the framework of the production relations that corresponded to them. The basis of these relations was absolute ownership of the slave-owner of the means of production and of the slaves and of the totality of the product produced as well. Slave-owning production relations promoted the development of the productive forces up to a certain moment but then began to hinder the progress of social production. The development of technology and production was hampered, the major social productive force - slaves - degraded physically and intellectually.

In the course of the growth of production the contradiction between the productive forces and production relations grew as sharp as it could be. The conflict between them found its expression in numerous slave uprisings. The slave-owning formation broke up under the blows of slave uprisings and the raids of foreign tribes. It gave way to a new feudal formation.

The basic features of the feudal formation were as follows: vast landed estates; the allotment of means of production, land above all, to the direct producer, serfs; the attachment of serfs to the land. The relations between the feudal lord and the serf were built up in a way to enable

the serf to receive a certain share (usually very insignificant) of the results of his labour. This was the incentive which made serfs interested in the results of their labour and stimulated their labour. Thus, feudalism found new ways of the growth of the productive forces. During the feudal epoch people learned how to make iron out of cast-iron, to build sailing-ships, to make primitive optical devices. They made wider use of water and wind energy as motive power. Crafts, trade and manufactories developed further.

Little by little new, capitalist production relations based upon the newly developed productive forces were forming in the bosom of the feudal formation. The bourgeoisie, the class which was the vehicle of the nascent social system needed political power, free labour and common market. Feudalism with its natural economy and the attachment of serfs to the land hampered the further development of the productive forces. The conflict between the productive forces and feudal production relations which began to hinder their development gave a start to the epoch of bourgeois revolutions, which ushered in the capitalist formation.

The productive forces of the capitalist formation were characterised by large-scale mechanised production. Workshops of craftsmen and manufactories gave way to huge plants, factories, mines and pits. Over 150-200 years of its existence capitalism contributed to the development of productive forces much more than all the previous stages of human progress.

The fast growth of the productive forces was brought about by new, capitalist production relations. Their basis is the private ownership of the means of production and the legal freedom of the industrial worker, the proletarian. However, personal dependence is replaced here by economic dependence. Being deprived of the means of production the proletariat has to sell their labour power.

The profit chase is a powerful stimulus for the expansion of production, the development of machinery, the improvement of industrial and agricultural technology. Due to the gigantic growth of the productive forces the capitalist relations of production have ceased to correspond to the former and have become shackles for their development. The

contradiction between the social character of the production process and the private capitalist form of the appropriation of its results has become the deepest contradiction of the capitalist system. It reached its climax by the end of the 19th century when capitalism had grown into imperialism, its highest and final stage. The main characteristic feature of imperialism is the domination of big monopoly capital in the economy, politics and ideology. Imperialism brings the contradictions of capitalism to their ultimate limits. The major contradiction of capitalism, the contradiction between the social character of production and the private capitalist form of appropriation of products of labour becomes deeper, the conflict between labour and capital grows sharper due to the growth of the degree of exploitation and oppression of the working masses by monopoly capital; the circle of exploiters becomes smaller; big capital subjects to exploitation not only the working class, but also the working peasantry, the wide circles of the working intelligentsia, petty bourgeoisie, part of the middle bourgeoisie, and peoples of other countries, above all of the colonial and dependent nations. In its struggle against national liberation movements imperialism renders support to the reactionary regimes of the newly liberated countries, hampers the social progress of these countries.

To strengthen its position, to survive in the competition with the growing world social system, to withstand the offensive of the working masses in capitalist countries and the growth of national liberation movements, to be able to conduct the aggressive policy the monopoly capital joins up its might with the strength of the bourgeois state into a single mechanism. A new, better developed form of monopoly capitalism has been formed - state-monopoly capitalism (SMC).

SMC has emerged in the epoch of imperialism and the general crisis of capitalism, in the epoch of the coexistence and struggle of two world systems - capitalism and socialism, of the growing influence of the forces of world socialism upon history, of the growing disparity between the present-day level of productive forces and capitalist production relations, incompatibility of a high stage of socialised production and

labour and the private capitalist way of appropriation, in the epoch of the accelerated formation of the material prerequisites of socialism, of the upswing of the workers' and liberation movements.

One of the vivid manifestations of the incompatibility of bourgeois production relations, SMC and the level of development of productive forces is the utilisation of the achievements of the current revolution in science and technology by state-monopoly capitalism with the purpose of gaining higher profits, building up exploitation of workers, intensification of labour, development and strengthening of the military-industrial complex, militarisation, creation of systems of weapons of mass destruction. The revolution in science and technology accelerates the process of economic socialisation; in the conditions of monopoly domination this leads to the reproduction of social antagonisms on ever greater scale and deeper than before. Not only the existing contradictions of capitalism become sharper, but the new ones appear. The foundations of the obsolete bourgeois social system are further undermined.

The victorious socialist revolution ushers in a new epoch in the history of mankind by abolishing the capitalist relations of production.

Socialist society develops in various forms, depending on the historical, national, geographical and other conditions, its development being influenced by well established traditions, customs, cultural values and other factors which are of social importance for the people of this or that country. However, notwithstanding the variety of forms, the main features of socialism are social ownership of the means of production, the relations of friendly cooperation of people free from exploitation both in production and in other spheres of social activity, state and political power of working people, the policy of peace and social progress. Only personal and small private ownership of the means of labour and consumer goods is preserved under socialism and protected by society, for it cannot be a source of exploitation. Socialism sees the operation of the principle "he who does not work, neither shall he eat", and payment according to the quanti-

ty and quality of labour as the law of distribution in society. Socialist production relations are in conformity with the character and the level of development of the modern productive forces and are being constantly improved in accordance with the progress of society.

The socialist countries have reached different stages of development, the highest stage being the stage of developed socialism. The society of developed socialism built in the USSR is a logical stage of social economic maturity of the new social system. This is the stage of development at which the basis for gradual transition to communism is being laid. It is characterised by highly developed productive forces, powerful advanced industry, large-scale, highly mechanised agriculture based on the principles of collectivism. Socio-political unity of the working class, collective-farm peasantry and people's intelligentsia, in which the leading role is played by the working class, has been formed at the stage of developed socialism. This is a society of socialist democracy, whose political system ensures effective administration of all social activity, ever growing active participation of the masses in the affairs of the state, the combination of citizens' real rights and freedoms with their duties and responsibilities to the society.

The advantages of socialism provide all conditions for thorough utilisation of the achievements of the scientific and technological revolution for the benefit of each person and society as a whole. Introduction of science into various spheres of economic and social activity, employment of all means offered by the revolution in science and technology for accelerating economic development and meeting the needs of all members of society - all this becomes possible due to the socialist character of property, planned organisation of production, active participation of the workers of physical and mental labour in the control and management of the economy.

Socialist society logically grows into full-fledged communism. Communism is a classless social system with a single national ownership of the means of production, complete social equality of all members of society in which

alongside with all-round development of people the productive forces will grow on the basis of ever developing science and technology, all sources of social wealth will undergo full development, and the great principle "from each according to his abilities, to each according to his needs" will be realised. Communism is a highly organised society of free and conscientious labourers where social self-government will be established, labour for the benefit of society will become a primary vital need and recognised necessity, the abilities of each person will be used for the greatest benefit of the people. The goal of communism is the all-round development of man, the realisation of his true freedom.

5. Civilisation and Social Progress

The Marxist-Leninist doctrine of the determining role of social production in the life of society, of the ascent of mankind from one socio-economic formation to another uncovers the basic, the common in the objective course of the world historical process. However this does not embrace the diversity of the real historical development of nations, lands and geographical regions. Marx wrote: "... The same economic basis -- the same from the standpoint of its main conditions - due to innumerable different empirical circumstances, natural environment, racial relations, external historical influences, etc.", may show "infinite variations and gradations in appearance, which can be ascertained only by analysis of the empirically given circumstances."¹ Consideration of these historically concrete circumstances in the general historical process is being done by the Marxist-Leninist doctrine of civilisations as social and cultural communities.

The major methodological principle of Marxism is the dialectical combination of the general and the particular, the fundamental and the specific in social development. On the other hand, one of the methods of bourgeois historiography is the absolute approach towards and the exaggeration of the role and importance of geographical, national, religious and other features in the historical progress of nations. This is the basis for bourgeois conceptions of civilisation.

¹. Karl Marx, Capital, Vol. 3, p. 792.

Criticism of Bourgeois
Conceptions of Civilisation

In world literature depen-
ding on the specialisation,
ideological approach, natio-

nality or the world outlook of authors in general and the purpose of research one can find different criteria according to which this or that civilisation is singled out in the analysis of socio-cultural communities determined by the term "civilisation", which existed at different times and had rather steady common features and characteristics.

Specific features of regions or continents can be taken for the basis of determining civilisation. One can say that this is a most popular principle of division, and modern scientific and every-day vocabulary abounds with such terms (the civilisation of ancient Mediterranean, European civilisation, Oriental civilisation, etc.). To a certain extent they reflect real characteristics expressing common cultural and political destinies, historical conditions and the like. However one has to point out that strictly geographical approach may not reflect (and sometimes obscures) the existence in this region of different historical types, different levels of development of socio-cultural communities.

Quite often civilisations are singled out according to the religious factor. Almost entire bourgeois literature and the periodical press write of Christian, Muslim, Buddhist and other civilisations.

Naturally, the influence of religion upon art, literature, psychology, upon the views of people, upon the totality of public life in certain periods was (and in certain regions of the world still is) enormous. In the Middle Ages in Europe, for instance, as Engels wrote, "the sentiments of the masses were fed with religion to the exclusion of all else",¹ each sphere of social life appreciated the influence of Christianity which hindered progressive development. And in later periods European literature, the fine arts, architecture, philosophy and other spheres of social consciousness cannot be fully un-

1. K. Marx and F. Engels, Selected Works in three volumes,
Vol. 3., p. 373.

derstood without the knowledge of Christian dogmata, biblical images and characters, moral and ethical conceptions.

These truly common characteristics of culture of European nations inherent in it throughout many centuries call for a scientific, materialist explanation, for uncovering their true role and social function. However the point of the matter is that in all interpretations of civilisation under examination the importance of these factors is strongly exaggerated, they are used for a mystical interpretation of the historical process and groundlessly present as something determining and even totally positive.

For instance, religious interpretation of civilisation is being persistently elaborated by the ideologists of the Christian Church. The prominent Catholic theologian Jean Danielou raised in dignity of Cardinal vigorously advocates the decisive role of Christianity in the development of world civilisation in spite of all historical facts.¹

Recently it has come in fashion among Catholic ideologists to elaborate and popularise the conception of the so-called "civilisation of love". This activity has been initiated by Pope Paul VI who speaking at a reception in Vatican on January 21, 1976, asserted that "civilisation of love" had to lean upon "regeneration" and "reconciliation."² Regeneration covers modernisation and improvement of the church dogmata, ideology, and organisation in the spirit of the times; reconciliation implies the dominance of peace in everybody's soul, in relations between classes and nations.

The conception of "civilisation of love" leaning upon the ideas of social consolidation and class conciliation is being actively propagated by Church organisations in various countries. In February 1976, the permanent Council of the Conference of Bishops of Italy adopted an appeal to the believers and all people of good will in support of greater contri-

1. See J. Danielou, La cultura tradita dagli intellettuali, Milano, 1974, p. 94.

2. L'Osservatore romano, January 22, 1976.

bution of Christianity to the present-day civilisation, of the satiation of civilisation with religion, thus contributing to the formation of the "civilisation of love."¹

The hypertrophied interpretation of certain moral components of culture within the framework of this or that civilisation which are taken for the determining principles of civilisation has become considerably widespread. One of such interpretations is given, for instance, in the book by Laleup and Nelis Culture and Civilisation.² Culture and civilisation, according to the authors, are determined by some self-developing concepts which stipulate their specific and distinguishing features, single out their major idea and meaning.

It is noteworthy to mention that in bourgeois literature the determination of civilisations is frequently made from a psychological point of view, by analysing, for instance, the concept of happiness. Such an attempt was made by J. Cazeneuve, a French psychologist. In his book Happiness and Civilisation,³ he singles out two basic ideals of happiness and, accordingly, two types of civilisation: the Apollonian and Dionysian ones. By using the Apollonian and Dionysian principles, elaborated by Schelling and widely utilised in Nietzschean literature (by which Schelling, for instance, attempted to express the essence of Apollo as the personification of forms and order, enlightenment and harmony as distinct from elemental and turbulent creative impulses of Dionysius shattering all forms) J. Cazeneuve builds up the following reasoning. The Dionysian ideal of happiness is characterised by its aspiration towards the future or the past, inner anxiety and tension, irrational impulses, by passion towards changes, by aggressiveness. While the Apollonian ideal is characterised by the wish to use the present, by rationalism and regulation, by comparative peaceableness and softness. J. Cazeneuve considers the struggle between the Dionysian and Apollonian types of civilisations

1. La civilità cattolica, November 21, 1976, p. 321.

2. J. Laleup et J. Nelis, Culture et civilisation. Initiation à l'humanisme historique, Tournai-Paris, 1956, pp. 21-22.

3. See J. Cazeneuve, Bonheur et civilisation, Paris, 1966, p. 102.

to be a major factor in our days. This being the basic contradiction, the true and determining contradictions between the socialist and capitalist countries become secondary, for the policies of each of these countries, the developing countries of the Third World including, depend, according to Gazeau, on combinations of the Dionysian and Apollonian elements. Thus, the principal meaning of the conflict between the two modern world socio-political systems and the two historical types of civilisations - bourgeois and communist - whose development is based on them, is being glossed over.

We have spoken above of the attempts to determine civilisation by relying on its hypertrophied spiritual components. Modern Western sociology often attempts to absolutise material and technological factors, to define civilisation according to the level of its technological and economic development. Such are, for instance, the conceptions of the representatives of so-called technological determinism - R. Aron, W. Rostow, J. Galbraith, A. Toffler and others, notwithstanding their differences. Different versions of "industrial" ("postindustrial", "superindustrial", "technethronic", etc.) civilisation have as their basis (covertly or openly) a number of common premises. In the long run their authors believe in the autonomous development of science, technology and organisation, which will stimulate the solution of a complex of problems facing mankind without changing bourgeois production relations. However they ignore the fact that the revolution in science and technology does not only overcome the basic contradictions of capitalism but reproduces social antagonisms on a wider scale.

There are also cases when several characteristics are taken for the basis of identifying socio-cultural organisms. True, for instance, the British historian and sociologist Arnold Toynbee considered civilisation to be the integrated totality of interconnected phenomena, wider than a nation but narrower than mankind. Let us cite a typical Toynbee's reasoning about singling out a special "local civilisation": Such temporal and spatial limitation presents a certain social unity in respect to which the USA, Great Britain,

France and the Netherlands appear as separate parts. It may be called Western Christianity, Western society or Western civilisation.¹ However, when speaking in the first ten volumes of his work A Study of History about 21 developing "local civilisations" (apart from "underdeveloped" and "petrified" ones) existing in the world he actually used dissimilar criteria for identifying civilisations. In some cases he used the regional principle (for instance, the Civilisation of the Far East), in other cases the religious one (Islamic Civilisation); a number of civilisations are countries (Russia, Persia, China, etc.). Though, when Toynbee interpreted the essence of civilisations he eventually took religion as a major principle.

All the principles pointed out above which serve as the basis for defining this or that civilisation are, as one can see, one-sided and cannot reflect the basic essence of a given socio-cultural community, though they characterise to a certain extent some of its specific features, reflect its peculiarities and the technological, economic, cultural and territorial features of a given social organism.

However, bourgeois authors do not see deep processes and causes behind the outwardly striking characteristics of phenomena. As a result the analysis of real causes and conditions of the origin, development and disappearance of certain civilisations is replaced by a search of analogies, by stating outward similarities or differences.

The Concept of Civilisation The classics of Marxism-Leninism introduced a versatile meaning into the concept of civilisation, trying thereby to express the diversity of the real historical process.

Above all it is necessary to point out that in many historical works of the last century the concept "civilisation" reflected the stage of social development which replaced the stage of savagery and barbarism. It was often used in this sense in Marxist literature as well, for instance in F. Engels's

1. See A. Toynbee, Civilisation of Trial, Cleveland, 1963,
pp. 195-196.

work The Origin of the Family, Private Property and the State.

The most general characteristic of the essence of civilisation in this work by Engels boils down to the following: "...Civilisation is that stage of development of society at which division of labour, the resulting exchange between individuals, and commodity production, which combines the two, reach their complete unfoldment and revolutionise the whole hitherto existing society."¹ Thus, civilisation was actually established alongside the intensification of the division of labour in a class society regulated by the laws which expressed the essence of class socio-economic relations. Developing this idea, Marx wrote in his work The Poverty of Philosophy: "The very moment civilisation begins, production begins to be founded on the antagonism of orders, estates, classes, and finally on the antagonism of accumulated labour and immediate labour. No antagonism, no progress. This is the law that civilisation has followed up to our days."²

Thus, the historical period of barbarism was followed by civilisation, which was antagonistic in its essence. Engels singled out three major historical types of antagonistic civilisation. "With slavery, which reached its fullest development in civilisation," he wrote, "came the first great cleavage of society into an exploiting and an exploited class. This cleavage continued during the whole period of civilisation. Slavery was the first form of exploitation, peculiar to the world of antiquity; it was followed by serfdom in the Middle Ages, and by wage labour in modern times. These are the three great forms of servitude, characteristic of the three great epochs of civilisation."³

Consequently, the antagonistic civilisation includes three major historical types of civilisation: slave-owning, feudal and capitalist. These main types of civilisation are stipulated by the principal factors which characterise the socio-

-
1. K. Marx and F. Engels, Selected Works in three volumes, Vol. 3, p. 330.
 2. K. Marx, F. Engels, Collected Works, Vol. 6, p. 132.
 3. K. Marx and F. Engels, Selected Works in three volumes, Vol. 3, pp. 331-332

economic formations. However, a pure type of civilisation is never and nowhere to be found. It is always manifested in different historically concrete forms. That is why there existed in historical development such forms of civilisation as the ancient Egyptian form of the slave-owning type of civilisation, the ancient Greek form of the slave-owning type of civilisation, etc.

The concept of civilisation with its diverse usage always concentrates one's attention upon the achievements in social sphere, the cultural activity of a given community, upon its consecutive growth, enrichment, the extent of the spread among the broad masses, as well as upon the scale and degree of participation of the masses in history-making. It also makes it possible to correlate the results of material and spiritual production, of social activity, achieved in a given social community, with human values, with their place in historical progress.

It is important to point out that in all cases it is possible to describe a given concrete form of civilisation - Sumerian, ancient Greek, Arab or West European and other ones - by leaning upon the outward features, even upon real specific characteristics. However, in order to uncover the essential features of a historical type of civilisation conditioned by a qualitatively different character of social relations, to reveal the substantial essence of a social organism (for instance, the slave-owning type of civilisation) whose manifestations and variations are the concrete forms of civilisation (for the given example: ancient Egyptian, ancient Roman and other forms of the slave-owning type of civilisation), we need a more profound analysis, based upon the abstracting and generalising mental activity. Otherwise the determinative substance of the given type of civilisation will be hidden behind certain features even if they are characteristic of the given form of civilisation.

In order to comprehensively and objectively understand the inner essence of each civilisation, the causes of its origin, development and historical destiny it is necessary to uncover its relations with material production and the historically conditioned mode of production, with the existing

work The Origin of the Family, Private Property and the State.

The most general characteristic of the essence of civilisation in this work by Engels boils down to the following: "...Civilisation is that stage of development of society at which division of labour, the resulting exchange between individuals, and commodity production, which combines the two, reach their complete unfoldment and revolutionise the whole hitherto existing society."¹ Thus, civilisation was actually established alongside the intensification of the division of labour in a class society regulated by the laws which expressed the essence of class socio-economic relations. Developing this idea, Marx wrote in his work The Poverty of Philosophy: "The very moment civilisation begins, production begins to be founded on the antagonism of orders, estates, classes, and finally on the antagonism of accumulated labour and immediate labour. No antagonism, no progress. This is the law that civilisation has followed up to our days."²

Thus, the historical period of barbarism was followed by civilisation, which was antagonistic in its essence. Engels singled out three major historical types of antagonistic civilisation. "With slavery, which reached its fullest development in civilisation," he wrote, "came the first great cleavage of society into an exploiting and an exploited class. This cleavage continued during the whole period of civilisation. Slavery was the first form of exploitation, peculiar to the world of antiquity; it was followed by serfdom in the Middle Ages, and by wage labour in modern times. These are the three great forms of servitude, characteristic of the three great epochs of civilisation."³

Consequently, the antagonistic civilisation includes three major historical types of civilisation: slave-owning, feudal and capitalist. These main types of civilisation are stipulated by the principal factors which characterise the socio-

1. K. Marx and F. Engels, Selected Works in three volumes, Vol. 3, p. 330.

2. K. Marx, F. Engels, Collected Works, Vol. 6, p. 132.

3. K. Marx and F. Engels, Selected Works in three volumes, Vol. 3, pp. 331-332.

The concepts of the socio-economic formation and civilisation perform different functions and are not equal in extension. In a sense the concept of the formation is broader than the concept of civilisation (we mean here the correlation of a given socio-economic formation and the historical type of civilisation based upon it); all factors and manifestations of civilisation are present and take their place within the framework of a socio-economic formation, whereas not all phenomena considered by the theory of formations are included in the concept of civilisation, but only those which reflect the above mentioned characteristic features of civilisation.

Speaking about the specific character of civilisation and of the fact that it is erroneous to identify it with the socio-economic formation on the basis of which it develops, it is necessary to point out that some features characteristic of this or that civilisation - peculiarities of culture, relations existing among people, their axiological attitude towards nature, etc., are quite stable, and are still preserved after the transition of a given nation to a higher stage of historical development, to a new socio-economic formation.

The difference between the concepts of formation and civilisation also consists in the fact that during the existence of one formation various civilisations belonging to one type originated and existed upon its basis. This is connected with the fact that the very establishment of this or that formation as well as its manifestations in various countries and regions have considerable peculiarities.

It is well known that the idea of a number of variations of civilisation existing upon the basis of one formation, all of them being the manifestation of the same mode of production in spite of all differences, was elaborated by K. Marx and F. Engels as applied to the feudal and capitalist modes of production. Analysing the diverse but essentially uniform process of establishment of bourgeois relations, K. Marx, relying on the research of huge concrete historical material, pointed out that in originating capitalism "assumes different aspects, and runs through its various phases in different

socio-economic relations and the system of government following from this. Such an approach allows us to understand the very nature of the cultural-historical system, and not only its separate elements, its technological and economic, social and spiritual characteristics.

An analysis of the inner objective laws of the functioning of civilisation, of the stages of its maturity presupposes the consideration of objective factors underlying the society, the factors which condition the integrity, stability and consistency of the historical process. Marxist-Leninist social science proceeds from the premise that such a function is discharged by a socio-economic formation, by a historically concrete mode of material production, which eventually stipulates all other forms of social and personal activity of people, the process of spiritual production included. This idea being the central one for the materialist understanding of history was constantly elaborated in the works of classics of Marxism which expounded the main principles of materialism covering human society and its history.

Only given such a historical-materialist approach one can comprehend and explain the cultural, regional, technological-cum-economic, religious and other peculiar features of a concrete socio-cultural community, in other words a given form of civilisation analysed above and which make it what it is. For if we speak, for instance, about the slave-owning type of civilisation - be it ancient Greek, ancient Roman or its any other variety -- the latter may have peculiarities in economic and extra-economic activity, a different pantheon of gods, different cultural, social, everyday and other characteristic features, but eventually these are the diverse forms of one and the same type of civilisation based upon the slave-owning formation. Hence, only a specific combination of cultural-material and spiritual-activity and certain social factors makes up the socio-cultural community which is fixed in a concrete form of civilisation. If the organic links with the formation factors - the mode of production, economic basis, specific superstructure -- are not taken into consideration, it will be impossible to understand the driving forces, inner objective laws and contradictions of a civilisation making up its history, the stages of its growth and decline.

organisation of society, of good and evil, beauty, love and maternity, concern for growing generations, meaning of life, of cognition of forces and laws of the universe, etc. Obviously, all this speaks of the unity and integrity of the socio-historical process on earth.

The mutual influence and enrichment of cultures, the world-wide cultural contacts which appeared as far back as in ancient times, at the outset of civilisation, and which developed steadily in spite of all the obstacles put in their way by antagonistic societies, have contributed to the establishment and consolidation of the historical unity of mankind.

The content of each civilisation is determined by the creative, constructive labour of the people; all the achievements in the field of material and spiritual development of society owe their origin to the people; that is why the labourers, the broad masses of people were and are the main driving force of civilisation. The activity of various social classes and their representatives play its role in the creation of values of civilisation, but the activity of the progressive classes and strata of society is of special importance.

The relation of the popular masses to the material and spiritual benefits is different in different types of civilisation. This is naturally due to the historically concrete character of the creation, distribution and consumption of values determined by the mode of material production characteristic of the given formation.

In a society of private ownership the benefits of culture and civilisation are directed to a great extent towards serving a comparatively narrow circle of socially privileged people; eventually the popular masses are deprived of them and furthermore some achievements of culture and civilisation are used against them. However, the major indicator of the progressiveness of a certain socio-cultural community is not only the totality of its material and spiritual achievements. The most important factor is how this totality of achievements influences upon the position of the individual, how it helps to uncover its spiritual, intellectual and physical

orders of succession, and at different periods."¹

The specific features of the socio-economic formation in different regions and countries, influencing upon the civilisations developing on its basis, are determined by a number of factors. For instance, by the presence or absence of economic structures left over from a previous social system, with differences in the correlation of the branches of production (industrial or agricultural), in the social structure, tradition of political administration, etc. Besides, the existence of a number of civilisations of the same type based upon the same socio-economic formation is conditioned by a peculiar, unique combination of cultural forms, ethnical and national features, religious differences, socio-political, aesthetic, legal and ethical views and institutions.

The progressive development of socio-cultural communities is the consecutive unfolding of the potentials of human mind and culture, the development of social organisation.

Each civilisation is distinctly original, it is characterised by unique features and makes its contribution to the common treasury of human experience, values, achievements. The very establishment, formation of a civilisation is achieved at a such temporal stage, when it is capable of creating values which become its particular contribution to the progressive development of mankind, which leave their trace in the history of society.

The interconnection and mutual enrichment of civilisations is an important fields of research. Let us take, for instance, the sphere of spiritual production. Different epochs and civilisations developing within their framework expressed their own understanding of the world and their attitude towards it. At the same time art, literature and other spheres of spiritual life undertook and solved similar problems of human existence that agitated all people everywhere and at all times. These are the problems of rational

¹. Karl Marx, Capital, Vol. I, p. 670.

our attention only to some regions and nations.

Civilisations in Latin America. This area in the pre-colonial epoch was populated by a great number of Indian tribes and ethnic communities that were at different stages of socio-economic and cultural development. The highest civilisations of pre-Columbian America, the result of the distinctive material and spiritual development of Indian society, flourished on the territories of Mesoamerica and the Andes.¹

As historical experience shows, only a highly developed agriculture could serve as the basis for the process of origin and formation of any local civilisation in ancient times. The research has established that in the second half of the first millennium B.C. there existed on the territory of Mesoamerica different modes of intensive and highly developed agriculture - chinampa in the valley of Mexico, irrigation in Oaxaca and Puebla. The system of milpa -- slash and turn highly productive farming - was also used. Some americanists hold that the milpa system was the economic basis which conditioned the formation of the early class Mesoamerican society.

Mesoamerican civilisations as socio-cultural communities appeared not long before the advent of the new era on the basis of assimilation of all values created by the cultures of the archaic period. These civilisations had a number of common features which were also characteristic of such civilisations of the Old World as Indian, Mesopotamian, Egyptian and others.

The decisive role of the main producer class - free tillers of the land; the existence of various forms of intensive, highly productive farming which formed the economic structure of the early class society; the existence of the despotic forms of rule; the influence of the well organized

1. From the scientific point of view, one may state that in the pre-Columbian epoch accidental encounters of certain groups of envoys from the Old World with American-Indian natives could not radically affect the process of origin and formation of hotbeds of civilisation in this part of our planet.

abilities, to what extent a person can partake in the formation of his being and the being of the given society. Speaking about the contrasts and contradictory character of civilisation under monopoly capitalism Lenin in his letter to American workers wrote: "Bourgeois civilisation has borne all its luxurious fruits. America has taken first place among the free and educated nations in level of development of the productive forces of collective human endeavour, in the utilisation of machinery and of all the wonders of modern engineering. At the same time, America has become one of the foremost countries in regard to the depth of the abyss which lies between the handful of arrogant multimillionaires who wallow in filth and luxury, and the millions of working people who constantly live on the verge of pauperism."¹

Lenin called the combination of great potentials for the solution of problems touching upon the interests of mankind and the social inability and reluctance to uncover them "civilised barbarism".

It is the necessity for a wide-scale and all-round solution of human problems, of the development of civilisation in the interests of the broad masses presupposes the surmounting of the limits and defects of bourgeois civilisation, that determines the necessity for its radical reorganization.

Peculiarities of Development of Civilisations

Having overcome their primitive state, all peoples took the road of developing their civilisation whose achievements became the greatest contribution to the development of world culture, to the creation of universal human values. Great is the contribution of the civilisations created by the peoples of ancient India, China, Egypt, Sumer, Babylon, of the Arabic East, of ancient states on the American Continent. The history of these civilisations still awaits its detailed study, a Marxist analysis, the determination of their historical place and significance. Here we shall draw

1. V.I. Lenin, Collected Works, Vol. 28, pp. 62-63.

and powerful priesthood were characteristic of both Mesoamerican and ancient Oriental civilisations.

High civilisations, such as Teotihuacan, Olmec, Zapotec, Toltec, and Maya originated and developed on the territory of Mesoamerica.

The data of archaeological and historical research of ancient Indian civilisations of Mesoamerica give grounds to believe that the main reason for the ruin of their classical centres was the large migrations of considerable masses of tribes and ethnic groups. The early 10th century A.D. saw the appearance of new centres of civilisation, well organised city-states, such as Toltec Empire (X-XII c.c. A.D.), Mayapán League (XI-XIII c.c. A.D.) and others. Having existed for two centuries, these socio-cultural communities perished under the blows of more powerful political unions.

By the time of Spanish Conquista at the beginning of the 16th century three highly developed civilisations had existed on the territory of Mesoamerica: the Aztec, Mistec and Maya ones. In the second half of the 16th century almost all territory of Mesoamerica with its greatest centres of civilisation was conquered.

The era of colonial slavery came to last about three centuries; it was the historical cause of the ruin of the distinctive autochthonous culture of the Indian peoples in Mesoamerica. But due to the viability of the traditions of the creative work of the peoples some most valuable achievements of the ancient Indian civilisations were preserved. They formed part of the treasure-house of modern Latin American and world culture.

As in the case of civilisations of the peoples of Mesoamerica a long period of the development of local Indian cultures preceded the formation of civilisations of the peoples of South and Central America.

The peoples which populated the territory of the Central Andes at the end of the second and the beginning of the first millennia B.C. reached such a development level of material and spiritual culture which allows us to suppose that a transition took place to an early class society, and to consider the Chavín culture the most ancient and richest civilisation

in this region of America.

The civilisation based on the Chavín culture identified itself in the ancient history of the pre-Inca America. This culture sprang up in the latter half of the second millennium B.C. and reached its climax in the 8th-4th centuries of the first millennium B.C. The remains of buildings made of plates of sandstone and basalt, a chain of underground canals, glasses with bas-reliefs and ceramics were found in the town of Chavín de Huántar, situated in the northern part of Peruvian upland. There is also a well-preserved three-storey building reminding a pyramid, 13 metres high and with narrow passages and rectangular halls. It was decorated with high reliefs - heads of jaguars, pumas and fantastic creatures carved of stone.

Ancient Peruvians knew how to build canals and reservoirs, to cultivate, apart maize, many other edible plants which during the colonial period almost doubled food stocks of mankind.

Out of the early civilisations of the Andes at the beginning of the first millennium A.D. the civilisations that sprang up on the basis of the Mochica, Gallinazo, Recuay, Paracas and Chilpa-Pampa cultures reached a high level of development. The first large state formation in this region in the second millennium A.D. was the state of Chimir with the flourishing Chimu culture.

A powerful centre of ancient civilisation Tiahuanaco, situated at an altitude of 3,800 metres, not far from the greatest lake of South America Titicaca, sprang up in the 4th-3rd centuries B.C. This civilisation which had climaxed by the end of the first millennium A.D. greatly influenced the vast territories of the Andes up to the Pacific.

This civilisation created quite a number of original pieces of sculpture, ceramics and architecture in particular. The most famous construction in Tiahuanaco is Acapana, a 15 metres high pyramid, whose remains represent the hill with a paved ground of 200 square metres.

The scientists studying America believe that in the 12th century A.D. Tiahuanaco, the flourishing centre of civilisation, was destroyed by powerful raids of nomadic Indian tribes.

Considerable socio-cultural differences existed on the territory of the Central Andes in the period directly preceding the Inca conquest. For instance, the highly developed socio-cultural community of Chimu existed alongside the ethnico-tribal formations which were at the stage of disintegration and the initial stage of transition towards a class society. In mountain areas the ancient civilisations gave way to tribal unions or to hostile tribal formations.

Later on, out of this diverse ethnico-tribal and socio-cultural reality there emerged the politically powerful groups which conquered the whole of the civilised region of the Andes and created a mighty Inca Empire.

The Inca culture which grew upon the basis of typical class relations coexisted with local cultures on the sea coast and in mountain areas of the Andes. This factor is clearly seen in the sphere of material culture of non-Inca tribes where the Inca component was weakly represented.

The Spanish conquest forcefully changed the direction of the socio-cultural development of the peoples of the Central Andes by ruining the distinctive achievements of their civilisations.

The city of Vilcabamba, the last capital of the Inca Empire, the city which became a symbol of struggle for national independence, is a monument to the diligence and talent of the peoples who created the civilisation of the Andes.

Indian (East) civilisation. In studying the problems of Indian civilisation historical materialism analyses the problems by using the principle of unity of the historical process, in other words, of the concept of substantial homogeneity, the unity of genesis, the community of determinants and laws of development, the principle of universal connection and interaction. The Indian civilisation is characterised by a complex interaction of the general and particular. It was formed on the basis of spatial community of the economic and cultural activity and contacts of population, including the common ethnic and spiritual tradition; of adherence of the given totality of social organisms to a certain stage of social and cultural development. The Indian civilisation was formed on the basis of stage-regional development of

culture connected with its style peculiarities and, in particular, with the socio-economic phenomenon of the plurality of economic structures which organised various economic forms into a single system. This led to the formation of common supra-national cultural tradition among the groups of related peoples. Indian cultural tradition means man's attitude to the environment, the place of his birth and maturity, the place where his ancestors lived and died; his attitude to a related group, to his place in the system of social contacts and to the character of social activity; the way man expresses himself as a social and spiritual being; the acceptance of values. Speaking about Indian civilisation it is necessary to keep in mind that it established the models and the hierarchy of conceptions, norms and deeds by which a person is guided in his thinking and activity; it is influenced by the chief religions spread in the country, by theological and ethical values.

One of the characteristic features of the Indian civilisation at the present stage consists in the fact that though capitalist relations develop in a number of economic branches, extremely backward productive forces and relations of production are still preserved in other branches, and there still exist in rural areas the tangle of strongly rooted vestiges of feudalism and capitalist relations.

"The productive forces ... are still woefully under-developed and medieval in many respects and in many areas. This is particularly true of rural India and of some of the older established industries",¹ though the fastest was the development of capitalist relations which became "the leading element in the total ensemble of the relations of production that make up the totality of the mode of production in independent India."² Speaking about agriculture as a whole, we

1. Mohit Sen, Revolution in India, 1977, p. 117.

2. Ibid., p. 119.

must bear in mind that changes are taking place there, too, but on a smaller scale than in industry. But this is a contradictory, slow and very uneven development. As it is justly stated in the Programme of the Communist Party of India: "Interpenetration of the strong survivals of feudalism and growing capitalist relations of production is the dominant character of socio-economic life in India's countryside."¹

However, when dealing with the specific features of the Indian civilisation, Marxism opposed the traditional notion of the East-West antithesis, because this unscientific attitude implies the existence of civilisations which do not have any inner reasons for transformation and which can be changed only by way of active outside intervention.

Apart from the comparatively insignificant number of cases in which the counterposing of Europe to Asia is a part of the artist's intention, the dichotomy of East and West is apt to make obstacles sooner than to assist in our attempts to understand the art and thoughts of another region. It distracts attention from the problems which are faced by a thinker or an artist in certain conditions, and makes people preoccupied with more abstract and general problems which hardly ever existed for him.²

Marxism is against contrasting the static, mystical, spiritual, "world-denying" culture of India with the dynamic, rational, materialist, active, "world-affirming" culture of the West. Marxist philosophy rejects the allegation that the people of India are preoccupied with purely spiritual problems and do not think about any improvement of their material position, that they are immersed in self-concentration and are not trying to solve their problems but to avoid the solution of any problems. It negates the myth which asserts that an Indian denies the material world, whereas a Western man is preoccupied with his material needs. All these allegations bring forward the "idea of India" but do not

1. Programme of the Communist Party of India, Patna, 1968, p. 24.

2. See I.M. Steadman, The Myth of Asia, New York, 1969, p.39.

consider India herself. Such an approach fully ignores one of the essential sides of social interaction, that is the fact that the very dynamic development of capitalist countries was secured by limiting and suppressing the dynamic development of the former colonies. Naturally, nobody is trying to deny the difference between the types of culture. However, in the history of world civilisation there was not single type of culture, which was exclusively preoccupied with the thoughts of the next world and ignored the sphere of material production. Such a conception has no grounds whatsoever. Certainly, there existed ascetics in India as well as hermits in Europe, but they were very few and, naturally, their share in the social structure of society and hence in social processes was very insignificant.

Though many Indian philosophers contrast materialism with some "Indian spirituality", it has to be borne in mind that materialism does not at all mean lack of spirituality. But the notion of Indian spirituality has a certain mystical character, for it is being asserted that the population of Asia is immersed in some spiritual, transcendental ideas, never thinking about the daily bread. In reality as in other countries the peoples of India are interested in solving the problems of this world: how to escape hunger and disease, how to have better clothes and better housing, how to get a job and secure a higher standard of living for their children.

Undoubtedly, it is necessary, when analysing the Indian civilisation, to pay attention to the unity of agriculture and crafts as the dominant type of activity in production, the unity of the individual and the communal, to the dependence of the individual upon the conditions of the community's existence, to the identity of politics and civil society. The uneven development and the existence of tribal survivals should be attributed to the peculiarities of the Indian civilisation. The prominent Indian Marxist philosopher D. Chatto-padhyaya thinks that the primitive society existed side by side with the development of civilisation up to present day and the survivals of this primitive or tribal society are clearly seen in various social institutions.¹

1. D. Chatto-padhyaya, Lokayata Darshan, Moscow, 1967, p.15
(in Russian).

There are also specific features in a number of superstructural institutions, which influence the basis. The role of traditions is great in this sphere. The specific features of the Indian civilisation cannot be understood without taking into consideration the religious factor. "The religious systems of the Orient - Hinduism, Buddhism, Brahmanism, Confucianism, Islam, numerous doctrines of religious sects - are undoubtedly different. But all of them have something in common: none of these religions, being up to the present time an important fastener of the whole of the superstructural sphere, have not suffered the deep reformation typical for European Christianity.

"None of them was able to offer such a powerful spiritual substantiation for the political and socio-economic activity of society and the individual as it was at the time offered by European Christianity, Protestantism in particular, under the veil of which capitalism developed so fast, and which moved the European peasants and the urban population to the front line of struggle for bourgeois formation... Religious systems of the West, especially beginning with the 14th-15th centuries, contributed to its social and economic development to a greater extent than the corresponding systems of the East. It was not by accident that the Christian countries of the West (all of them are situated in temperate climate) and not Islamic and Buddhist countries (many of them situated in tropical climate) became the birthplace of capitalism."¹ However unlike the bourgeois conceptions Marxism has never preached the dichotomy of civilisations of the Orient and the West, because such an approach has a certain ideological trend and implies a deviation from the major aspects of socio-economic reality, from the inner class contradictions characteristic of this or that world. At the same time Marxism pays attention to the extraordinary stability of certain traditions, customs, structures and institutions of the Indian civilisation.

The tradition is the powerful force which is to be taken into consideration because its utilisation is vitally necessary for both revolutionary and reactionary classes who

¹. R.A. Ulyanovsky, "The Specific Features of the Countries of the Orient", Narody Azii i Afriki, No.5, 1979, pp. 71-72.

derive from tradition their confidence both in the legality of their existence and in the present and future.¹ Tradition plays an important role in rallying the people: their functions of storing and transferring the experience and values over from generation to generation assist in socialisation of the individual, in giving individuals and social groups certain social characteristics; they contribute to the reproduction and preservation of relations of property, the stabilisation of economic relations, the formation of basic methods and rules of political struggle. They influence the ideology, public administration, social structure, cultural life of a country. Depending on concrete conditions tradition can either hold up or accelerate the progress of a country.

Civilisation of the Arab East. In the early medieval period the majority of the population of Arabia, with the exception of the southern part of the peninsula, consisted of the nomads-cattle-breeders. The settled population in rural areas was engaged chiefly in agriculture, while crafts and trade were developed in towns.

In the 5th-6th centuries, the overwhelming majority of the Arabs lived in clans and tribes.

Slave labour was of major importance in cattle-breeding, even more so in irrigation and in crafts. As the intertribal conflicts could not be a sufficient source of slaves (as a rule, the tribes ransomed the people of their tribe taken prisoners or exchanged them), slaves in Arabia were aliens, chiefly Africans.

Proceeding from the periodisation of pre-class society given by F. Engels in his work The Origin of the Family, Private Property and the State, it is easy to determine the level of Arab production and cultural development in the 5th-6th centuries (with the exception of the settled population in Yemen) as the upper stage of barbarism which "begins with the smelting of iron ore and passes into civilisation through the invention of alphabetic writing...".²

1. See V.I. Lenin, Collected Works, Vol. 3, pp. 37-40.

2. K. Marx and F. Engels, Selected Works in three volumes, Vol. 3, p. 208.

In the 4th century A.D. alphabetic writing appeared among northern Arabs (Nabataean writing in Syria and Jordan). Later on it superseded south Arabic (Sabaeen) writing in Arabia.

Religious beliefs among Arab tribes in the early period (with the exception of settled population of Yemen) represented the mixture of fetishism, totemism and animism. But in the conditions of deterioration of the primitive-communal system and the formation of early class society it was inevitable that monotheism should come instead of polytheism, because only such religion could reflect the aspiration for the unification of Arabia under the aegis of central power. The evolution of the early Arab form of monotheism - hanifism and the emergence of a new religion - Islam - took place under the influence of social, economic and psychological factors.

"The community of believers" (umma) became the organising basis for an Arab state which appeared in the 7th century. Engels pointed out that "the first attempt to form a state consisted in breaking up the gentes...".¹ The major function of the new Arab state was to secure with the help of armed forces the economic subordination of the labouring majority to the wealthy minority. Thus, the 7th century in Arab history was marked by the formation of a vast state - the Arab Khalifat which appeared due to many conquests and was substantially expanded in the 8th century.

The Arab penetration beyond the borders of Arabia which began since the middle of the first millennium A.D. got its fast development in the initial period of the Arab Khalifat. In the 7th and 8th centuries the Arabs conquered Syria, Mesopotamia, South Iran, part of Central Asia, Egypt, North Africa, part of the Pyrenean Peninsula and some other territories, spreading there the Arab language and adopting in turn the highly developed culture of the conquered peoples. Some of the conquered lands were Arabised, their native population adopted either fully or partially the language and reli-

1. K. Marx and F. Engels, Selected Works in three volumes, Vol. 3, p. 277.

gion of the conquerors in the run of centuries. The mixture of the Arabs with the native population resulted in the formation of a number of Arab nationalities. Other countries conquered by the Arabs -- Transcaucasia, Central Asia, Persia located to the east of the Khalifat, the Pyrenean Peninsula in the western part of it -- managed eventually to defend their political, cultural and linguistic independence in their struggle against the invaders. On the conquered territories the Arabs encountered the socio-economic relations and forms of property typical for the developed slave-owning system or early feudalism previously unknown to them.

Being at a lower level of social development than the conquered civilised peoples, the Arabs could not all at once wield the complicated apparatus of administration and exploitation and were content with the seizure of loot and collection of tribute from the native population. They left untouched the socio-economic relations and the administrative-fiscal bodies, including the local administrative bodies, judicial institutions and police, and took up the position of a ruling group dominating over the local feudal society.

So in the Arab Khalifat there appeared a very complicated conglomerate of socio-economic and ethnic relations which imparted specific features to the whole of Arab civilisation. The tribal institutions of the Arabs were incorporated into the slave-owning and feudal structure of the conquered countries, the formation of a transitional type of society which included the elements of the slave-owning and feudal formations as well as the clan and tribal relations typical for the period of the disintegration of the primitive-communal system.

The economic situation in the Khalifat was very complicated. The main branch of production in the Arab state was agriculture based on irrigation. Drastic socio-political complications, continuous wars and uprisings often brought the elaborate irrigation systems to the destruction and caused the decay of agricultural production. The restoration of irrigation was possible chiefly due to the existence of state machinery which exercised economic and extra-economic compulsion. In this connection we can quote the letter of Engels

to Marx where he wrote: "An Oriental government never had more than three departments: finance (plunder at home), war (plunder at home and abroad), and public works (provision for reproduction)."¹

The Khalifat represented feudal, theocratic despotism holding in its hands plenary ecclesiastical and temporal powers. This state retained its xenocratic character only at the beginning of its existence, for quite soon the Arab aristocracy lost its exclusive position and had to share the income and power with local feudal lords and the tribal clique.

The formation and subsequent disintegration of the Khalifat state which was an artificial conglomeration of different peoples and ethnic groups was beneficial for the development of culture both of the conquered peoples and the culture of the Arabs themselves. New centres of Arab culture sprang up in Andalusia, Marrakesh, Cairo, Damascus, and Aleppo. That time saw the prominent figures of Arab culture and science, the development of Arab medicine, mathematics, natural sciences, art and architecture. Arab civilisation reached its climax.

In the 16th century, all Arab countries (except Morocco, Nejd and Oman) were conquered by the Turks and became part of the Ottoman Empire. By conquering the Arab countries the Turks usually preserved their social system.

The Turks abolished the communal ownership of land but often preserved the Arab fellah community as an appendage to the system of feudal exploitation. The community was tied up by mutual responsibility for the payment of tributes and duties, and also secured the tilling of the landlord's land. All these measures strengthened the feudal system in the Arab countries; the feudal mode of production became predominant on the territory of the Arab world.

In the 16th-18th centuries, the Arab cities were characteristically medieval. In the period of Ottoman domination trade and crafts developed further. However, trade in the Ottoman Empire was not of an equivalent character and unlike

¹ K.Marx,F.Engels, Selected Correspondence, p. 76.

in the Khalifat foreign merchants played the leading role in this trade. This hindered the development of national capital and put local merchants in an unequal position. All this held up the development of capitalist relations in Arab countries.

The craft industry in Arab countries was still based on the shop structure with the predominance of manual labour. Its development was behind the progressive European countries where the transition to manufactures and later to mechanised production had already taken place.

The end of the 17th century saw a deep crisis of the Ottoman Empire: economic dislocation, corruption of state machinery, centrifugal tendencies, demoralisation of the army, decline of culture, etc.

In the 19th and early in the 20th centuries most of the Arab countries became colonies or semi-colonies of European powers. The Great October Socialist Revolution exercised enormous influence upon the liberation struggle of Arab peoples. It began a new stage in the history of Arabs - the stage of struggle for complete national liberation.

The defeat of fascism in the Second World War, the formation of the world system of socialism and the consequent general weakening of world imperialism resulted in the powerful upswing of the Arab national liberation movement. At present all the Arab countries have gained their political independence.

The general and the specific in the development of African countries. In the pre-Marxist period the socio-philosophical writings spread the thesis about the notorious non-historical nature of African peoples. Many of the bourgeois authors in the period of the blossom of colonial empires looked upon the African continent as being unworthy of the historian's attention. Others tried to prove that African history began only with the European penetration on African territory and present African peoples only as objects of the civilising activity of white people.

By leaning upon the irrefutable data of science historical materialism has laid bare the unsoundness of the racialist "theories" about the non-historicity of African peoples

and has shown the active creative role of the Africans in the development of world civilisation from the ancient times to the present day.

At the same time there are ideologists among the Africans themselves who do not recognise the unity of the historical process, who try to present the history of the peoples of the continent as being out of the general context of human progress. A well-known African thinker, ex-president of Senegal, Leopold Senghor (undoubtedly following the German philosopher Spengler and under his influence) looked upon each civilisation as a self-sufficing exclusive whole; he asserted that the Negro-African civilisation is a separate social organism, that African society is an utterly exclusive historical individuality with its unique soul and destiny.

Such points of view hardly conform with what is known about the past of the continent and with its present-day reality. To insist upon the uniqueness of Negro-African culture and its ways of development means to exclude Africa from the general course of the world's development, to doom African peoples to economic, technological and cultural backwardness and to try to perpetuate it.

The history of Africa is one of the pages of world civilisation, though still not read to the end. The development of African peoples went along the same course, though slowly, as the development of the peoples of other continents. It has been established that African peoples went through all stages of development of stone industry; that they mastered the art of iron melting before the Europeans did, and even in the 15th century the population in the lower reaches of Niger, for instance, was more artful in the technology of bronze smelting than the population of Europe. The countries of Tropical Africa did not know the slave-owning mode of production, though slavery in its patriarchal, domestic form and slave trade was known long enough, whereas the North and North-East Africa lived through the formation and blossoming of the classical slave-owning system. A distinctive feudal formation did not develop in Tropical Africa, but in the run of many centuries there existed feudal states and more or less developed, depending on concrete local conditions, feudal

exploitation. At present the capitalist relations of production are developing in a number of African countries. Other African states have entered the non-capitalist path of development and proclaimed socialist orientation. They are creating objective and subjective prerequisites for the construction of a society without exploitation of man by man. Eventually, all African as well as other countries will come to a socialist future, as Lenin said.

The common objective laws do not, however, exclude the specific features and peculiarities in the development of separate peoples and the vast areas of this great continent.

Socialism - the Formation of a Qualitatively New Civilisation

In spite of substantial differences in the historical development of nations, countries and civilisations, the world revolutionary process

of our epoch leads the whole of mankind along the path of radical remaking of all social life towards the creation of a new type of civilisation.

Socialist civilisation is based upon public ownership of the means of production, free labour of workers, planned management of the national economy, and political power vested in the people.

An important characteristic feature of the new civilisation is the incorporation of all greatest achievements of previous generations, utilisation of common human values for the benefit of the further development of each person and the society as a whole.

The factors and prerequisites and values which contribute to the further development and strengthening of human unity are common to mankind.

The bearer, guarantor, the leading force of socialist civilisation is the working class which acts as the mouthpiece expressing the interests of working masses, the best interests of mankind. Steady realisation of the class-proletarian principle, strengthening and deepening of socialist principles contribute to the gradual solution of the contradiction between class and human principles.

The coincidence of interests of the working class, the theory and practice of socialism with common human values determines the fact that the new civilisation is a thrifty successor of the values accumulated by the foregoing historical process, the fact that the values created by it conform as never before with the essence, the needs of human development, the fact that Marxism-Leninism reaches its programmatic goals — the establishment on earth of a meaningful and free, peaceful and happy life for all nations and stands for the deepest possible expression of common human interests.

As social practice has shown, the morality of conscious advocates of the new civilisation incorporated the basic human moral norms which had been elaborated by the popular masses in past epochs in their struggle with social evil and moral defects: diligence, honesty, modesty, proper pride, comradeship, and mutual respect.

The idea of friendship among nations, the necessity of their life in peace and concord, the idea of their cooperation, exchange of cultural values, etc., were developed, praised and propagated by the thinkers of different epochs and nations. Their ideas and notions are close to us, understandable and dear, they are naturally part of our culture. At the same time one cannot but see the radically new brought about by socialist civilisation in the idea (and the practice, in particular) of friendship among nations which is being examined here. It finds its vivid expression in socialist, proletarian internationalism, in solidarity of champions of freedom, peace and social progress.

Naturally, many elements of culture are of a class character in class society and this demands a party approach in their understanding, assimilation and revaluation. Therefore, the reactionary elements and tendencies should be radically rejected so that out of each national culture, quoting Lenin, one can take "exclusively those of its elements that are consistently democratic and socialist."¹ Lenin considered the

1. V.I. Lenin, Collected Works, Vol. 19, p. 247.

utilisation and critical reworking of all that was valuable in the progress of human civilisation inspired by the practical experience of the victorious proletariat to be a major task of true proletarian culture.

One of the major conditions in the field of upbringing & the new man and shaping up a scientific materialist world outlook the Marxist-Leninist parties consider serious and systematic assimilation of knowledge and enriching memory with, as Lenin pointed out, "a knowledge of all the treasures created by mankind",¹ assimilation of the achievements of the truly progressive social and natural sciences, of truly artistic values of world literature and art.

Thus, while rejecting in principle the antagonistic society opposite to it, socialism retains common human achievements in various fields of social being, all positive attainments gained in the course of the development of the previous social system.

Naturally, the essence of socialist civilisation is characterised above all not by the things inherited from the previous socio-economic formations. The revolutionary upheaval which has overturned all layers and spheres of social and personal life is significant, in the first place, for the development of its own socialist relations and values, for the creation of new economic, socio-political and spiritual principles and cultural orientations.

The social essence of the new civilisation, the nature of its economic, socio-political, ideological, psychological characteristics are most convincingly expressed in their orientation towards the formation and development of the foundations of such a social system "in which the full and free development of every individual forms the ruling principle."² For the first time in the history of civilisation the conformity of principles of social order with the needs of the individual exists and, therefore, for the first time in history there is no gap between the world outlooks offered by society, its

1. V.I. Lenin, Collected Works, Vol. 31, p. 287.

2. Karl Marx, Capital, Vol. I, p. 555.

ideological principles and the interests of the individual.

The realisation of these principles ensures the development of the true human essence, and opens up qualitatively new social possibilities unknown before. We mean here the liberation of labour, overcoming its alienation; the truly and not formally proclaimed freedom from all forms of social and national oppression; the consistent growth of the people's well-being; the socio-political equality of all citizens, all social groups, classes, nations and nationalities, their real participation in administration of all social and state matters; their wide access to the values of science and culture, participation in cultural creation; the atmosphere of social optimism, their confidence in their own future and the future of their children; the cooperation of free labourers, the care of the society for man and man for the society; the internationalist friendship and all-round cooperation of all nations and nationalities; the triumph of collectivist ideas over those of individualism, over market competition, indifference towards man typical for the private property relations; the development among people of the sense of self-respect, public duty, of friendly mutual assistance. This is a new, humane, social climate expressed in big and small things, felt in all spheres of personal and social life.

Major basic qualities of the new civilisation are characteristic of all countries of the socialist community guided by Marxist-Leninist ideas, though the concrete forms of their manifestation are influenced in each separate country by national, social, historical and cultural features and traditions.

X X X

We have pointed out here the specific features of the early civilisations created by the peoples of Latin America, Asia, Africa and the essence of socialist civilisation.

The study of the problem of civilisation and its place in the historical development of mankind can be summed up in the following conclusions:

First, the concept of civilisation expresses the historically concrete peculiarities of life of peoples. Each civilisation is based upon its socio-economic formation.

Second, the existence of a number of one-type civilisations based upon one and the same socio-economic formation is conditioned by a specific, unique combination of forms of culture, ethnic and national characteristics, religious, specific socio-political features, aesthetic, legal and other views and institutions.

Third, the development of civilisations as socio-cultural communities is the consistent unfolding of the potentialities of human intellect, scientific and cultural progress, the development of the social organisation.

Fourth, the major motive force of the civilisation is the popular masses, the real makers of all material and spiritual values.

The Progress along the Path
of Socialist Orientation

The emergence on the international arena of the growing number of countries liberated from colonial oppression, the rapid growth of their role in the world development, the appearance of a large group of countries which reject the capitalist system, acute political and ideological struggle unfolding in the world in connection with their choice of the path of their development - all this makes the problems of developing countries of exclusive importance and interest.

It is in these countries that have fallen behind in their economic, social and cultural development due to the decades-long exploitation by the imperialist powers that the greater part of the world's population lives. It is not hard to understand the importance of this fact for the balance of world forces, and how much will depend upon the course (capitalist or socialist) which will be chosen by these countries.

Which of the two possible directions of social development will be chosen by the liberated countries? Are they going to go through all the historically known stages of social development, including the stage of capitalist development, up to its state-monopoly phase, or are the peoples of the developing continents who have experienced to the full the bitter fate of colonial oppression by imperialism will have as "historical compensation" the chance to go over to socialism

by-passing capitalism?

The basis for the elaboration of the conception of progressive development for these countries is Lenin's idea that in the modern epoch the backward countries will go over to a socialist system by-passing the capitalist stage of developing with the help of the proletariat of advanced countries. This Lenin's prevision made as early as in 1920 has been justified in practice. Today there are many countries in Asia and Africa which have taken the course of non-capitalist development, the course towards building in future a socialist society. In our time, due to the existence of the socialist community exercising ever growing influence upon the course of world events, in the conditions of the deepening crisis of capitalism and the growing authority of socialism, the countries which have fallen behind in their development get the chance to defend their choice of the path of progress. The help of the socialist community countries, the understanding of the social and economic hopelessness of the capitalist way of development make it possible for these countries to start the development in the direction of socialism at an "accelerated rate" by-passing capitalism.

Naturally, the socialist orientation of internal and foreign policy of the newly-free countries does not mean socialism yet, it means a long pre-socialist stage when the necessary prerequisites for the construction of socialism are being created. However, at this stage it is possible to achieve essential improvement in the position of the popular masses, to develop the economy on the basis of new transitional, revolutionary-democratic social relations.

What are the criteria of socialist orientation? They are: the change in the class character of political power, removal of bourgeois and feudal elements from power; transition of power into the hands of progressive forces acting in the interests of the popular masses; formation of a new, national democratic state and later of a new state machinery; liquidation of political and economic domination of imperialism; creation of public and cooperative sectors and factors for their priority development; limitation and regulation of the private capitalist sector; establishment and development of

all-round cooperation with socialist states; general democratic reforms creating the economic and social prerequisites for socialist construction and carried out for the benefit of the popular masses and with their ever growing participation (agrarian reforms, liquidation of social privileges, progressive labour and social legislation); struggle against the ideology of exploiters, for the ideology based upon the principles of scientific socialism.

Thus, the essence of socialist orientation is the anti-imperialist, anti-feudal and partial anti-capitalist transformations whose goal is to create the material, scientific, technological, social and political prerequisites for the subsequent construction of socialism. The general democratic transformations are conducted with an eye to the socialist perspective. Apart from the questions of the essence and criteria of socialist orientation, important role is played by the questions about the forms of state in which it can take place, about the economic and political principles of such states, about the correlation of internal and external factors influencing the said processes, etc.

Of major importance is the conclusion about the role of national revolutionary democrats as a new socio-political force, originally non-proletarian, but capable of leading the popular masses who are rejecting capitalism and choosing a new orientation in the countries where proletariat has not yet been formed as a class.

One of the specific features of the countries with a socialist orientation is the existence of the private capitalist sector during a certain period. The indiscriminate nationalisation of the petty-commodity producer resulting from the voluntarist policy of "leapfrogging" some stages of development and putting an end to all forms of exploitation at once can lead to the disorganisation of the economy, social upheavals and eventually to the loss of revolutionary-democratic power. Alongside this there is a danger of unlimited, uncontrolled development of the private sector capable of demoralising the society, bringing it to sweeping over by a bourgeois chaos. This is a real contradiction, possibly the gravest contradiction of the non-capitalist way of development.

The resolution of this contradiction is possible only under the guidance of a state which is non-capitalist as to its ultimate goals.

There are serious external contradictions of the socialist orientation which stem from the fact that the socialist-oriented countries live and will still live in the world capitalist market system. International capital drags these countries towards itself, tries to assist their degeneration and embourgeoisement by using methods of modernised neocolonialism, to undermine the new social system by way of plots and even direct aggressive actions. But this does not form insurmountable obstacles for socialist orientation: the powerful and beneficial influence of socialist states upon the international situation, the policy of detente, peace and international security essentially hinder and limit the possibilities of imperialist intervention, ensure the freedom of the developing countries' advance along the chosen path.

6. Insolvency of Modern Bourgeois Sociology

In the post-war decades, in the conditions of the sharpening social, political, spiritual crisis of the capitalist society and at the same time in the situation of rapid industrial and scientific development there appeared a new group of theorists in the foreground of bourgeois sociology. They have ostentatiously rejected the historical and philosophic claims to uncover the general direction and sense of human history and concentrated their attention upon the modern epoch and the nearest future of human society. The central idea of these theorists is that the source of social well-being lies in the progress in the scientific and technological sphere. The new group of theorists has become the mouthpiece of the most dynamic strata of the modern bourgeoisie - the leaders of big monopolies, the so-called technocrats.

Industrialism

The ideological substantiation of the technocrats' claims to power and influence

was the theory of industrial society, worked out in the 1950s by W. Rostow, R. Aron and other bourgeois sociologists. "Industrialists" criticised the pessimism of the cyclic schemes

of social development (A. Toynbee, P. Sorokin and others), the futurological emphasis being felt more and more in their works.

The progress of technology and technical know-how is the starting point of the theories of "industrial society". Out of the complex dialectics of productive forces and production relations the "industrialists" metaphysically tear out technology and technological relations and view them separately from the forms of property and production relations.

The logic of industrialist theories is built up upon counterposing the scientific and technological revolution to the social revolution. They ignore the existence of social, class relations as a specific, independent factor of social life.

The optimism of the industrialists' futurological theories was generated by the peculiarities of post-war development of capitalism, such as the accelerated rate of economic growth and the relative social stabilisation, which gave birth to "technological determinism" and the conception of "deideologisation".

The doctrine of "deideologisation" is an integral part of the theory of "industrial society" which, like classical physics, counts on the world's linear development, on the automatic effect of technological progress.

No matter how diverse the theories of "industrial society" are, all of them preach one and the same idea: modern technology and technical know-how condition all sides of social life, they call for the establishment of power by scientists, engineers and managers.

Some of the theorists of "industrial society" directly call their constructions as alternative to the Marxist-Leninist doctrine of the socio-economic formation. Walt W. Rostow, for instance, in his book The Stages of Economic Growth. A Non-Communist Manifesto writes openly that his theory is called upon to challenge Marxism and dislodge it as a method of studying modern history.

In the late 60s, the contradictions of state-monopoly capitalism, which according to the theory of "industrial

society" had been "resolved", gave birth to mass actions by the working class, youth, students against imperialism, the war in Vietnam, the suppression of democratic freedoms, racial discrimination, the bureaucratisation of various spheres of life, environmental pollution due to insufficient control over industrial development, etc. These movements have demonstrated the danger of a fetishistic approach towards economic growth, the fallaciousness of technological progress leading not to the end of the century of ideologies, but to new hot-beds of social tension. The back side of capitalist rationality is spiritual emptiness, dehumanisation of the individual, estrangement from free creative activity, and reduction of the totality of human activity to "consumption race."

The aggravation of social contradictions of capitalism conditioned the search of ways for the further improvement of the conceptions of industrialism. A new trend appeared, which we conditionally term as post-industrialism. The West German sociologist Ralf Dahrendorf wrote about "post-capitalist society", Walt W. Rostow of "post-nature economy", Herman Kahn and Anthony Wiener -- of "post-economic society", Zbigniew Brzezinski -- of "technetronic society," Alvin Toffler -- of "superindustrial society" and finally Daniel Bell -- of post-industrial society".

According to D. Bell, five major characteristics of "post-industrial society" can be singled out: first, transition from the economy of commodity production to the economy of services; second, predomination of a "class" of specialists and technicians; third, priority of theoretical knowledge; fourth, planning of technological growth; fifth, creation of "intellectual technology".

What strikes one's eye is the lack of description of the forms of property in an analysis of social development. And this is not accidental. Bell is convinced that it is technology that transforms social relations and our perception of the world by-passing production relations.

The peculiarity of the futurological construction of Toffler is the claim to create an optimistic ideal of the future and thereby to replace the communist ideal. Here he speaks not of the obsolete petty-bourgeois consumer optimism

limited by satiety and comfort but of the optimism which takes into consideration some needs of spiritual development.

It is noteworthy that the conception of "post-industrial society" is based on the fact that modern capitalism lives through internal transformation, which marks the advent of the era of "post-industrial society", the proof of it being considered to be the changes in the relations between production, technology and science. Actually this is a new version of technological determinism. And technology and technical know-how are treated from the idealistic point of view, only as the results of scientific development and scientific production.

The theorists of "post-industrial society" analyse major contradictions in the context of relations between the new economic and social structure and the political and cultural superstructure, between those who possess knowledge and information and those who are deprived of them.

The fact that the links between the level of productive forces and the character of production relations are ignored allows post-industrialists to speculatively "resolve" the major contradiction of capitalism between the social character of labour and the private form of appropriation. However, capitalist production relations have long ago ceased to be the optimal social form of motion of productive forces. They limit and deform scientific and technological progress, contribute to the growth of the gap between scientific-technological and social development of society.

Alarmists

The seventies in bourgeois sociological literature are marked by the upswing of a

huge wave of pessimistic forecasts concerning the future and gloomy predictions expressed by a number of bourgeois theorists within the framework of a non-government organisation - "the Club of Rome", specially created in the late sixties to study the dynamics, rates and limits of growth in the modern world. The pessimistic forecasts of an inevitable ecological disaster sobered up those who quite recently was carried away by optimistic predictions of the advent of "the era of universal prosperity". And though at present the frantic dispute

between the technocratic optimists and social pessimists is going on, hopeless pessimism penetrates ever deeper in bourgeois mentality.

Social pessimism and technocratic optimism are the extremes, typical forms of bourgeois split mentality immersed in itself and not able to see a way out of the preset limits of the bourgeois understanding of human perspectives. Both conceptions of the world have but one goal: they try to solve the problems and resolve the contradictions of the present and future society without going beyond the framework of bourgeois structures of its social organisation.

The growth of contradictions in the interrelations of society and nature generated by capitalism brought about the necessity of solving the global problems of ecology, demography, energy, extraction of natural resources which face mankind.

Bourgeois scientists Jay Wright Forrester, Dennis H. Meadows and Donella L. Meadows, M. Mesarovic, E. Pestel and others¹ have advanced a number of prognostic global models offering different versions of getting out of the deadlock with the help of computers.

However, none of the models demonstrates the untenability of capitalism in solving the global problems, does not show realistic social ways out of the existing critical situation. Only socialism that has an objective basis for harmonious relations among people built upon the foundation of socialist property is able to overcome the old type of interrelations between nature and society and to go over to a new stage of interaction with nature, to establish their unity on the basis of a new system, of conscious activity of people, of harmonious relations between man and nature.

In the modern epoch when socialism has gained firm ground in a considerable part of the world and is developing

1. D.H. Meadows et al., The Limits to Growth, New York, 1972; J.W. Forrester, World Dynamics, Cambridge (Mass.), 1974; M. Mesarovic, E. Pestel, Mankind at the Turning Point, New York, 1974; G. Tinbergen et al., Reshaping the International Order, New York, 1976; E. Laszlo et al., Goals for Mankind, New York, 1977.

steadily, when the forces are growing within capitalist society which stand for social liberation and capable of leading victorious struggle against the system of exploitation and oppression, the historical doom of capitalism becomes more vivid than ever.

Bourgeois Empirical Sociology

The empirical trend in modern bourgeois sociology represents a specific field many adherents of which renounce

in declarative form their links with social and philosophical conceptions. Bourgeois empirical sociology not only carries out the task of collecting and systematisation of facts necessary for more effective administration of society on the part of the ruling classes, but also exercises an essential ideological function: it diverts masses, above all intellectuals, from major social questions, trying to direct their mental activity upon partial, local problems. While carrying out these tasks bourgeois empirical sociology works out the means of social control, social administration and regulation, looks for a theoretical substantiation of petty social reformism.

Bourgeois empirical sociology tries to strengthen the existing social order, to find practical recommendations for its support. Its recommendations notwithstanding their insufficiency and narrowness are used for class purposes by the state and big business.

The weakness of empirical sociology consists in the fact that it considers only certain sides of life, is based on the sum total of certain knowledge of facts and phenomena without taking into consideration the general picture of reality, real diversity of internal ties and mediations which eventually make distorted the results of such limited socio-logical research.

The absolutisation of empiricism precludes the search for objective laws of social development, leads to uncertainty, illogical foundations, to subjective starting premises in research, to inability to cognise the general laws of social development.

Beginning with the early 60s bourgeois empirical sociology suffers a serious crisis. Being concentrated upon the

solution of narrow practical tasks of administering the capitalist society it turned out to be impotent confronted by acute social and political problems of the last decades: the economic and financial crisis, the ecological crisis, unemployment, the development of class and national conflicts.

Functionalism and the Theories of "Social Change"

Methodologically, bourgeois empiric sociologists and industrialists lean upon structural and functional

analysis. Major principles of functionalism studying society as a self-organising and stable system which are analogous to some extent to biological organism, were formulated as far back as in 19th century by the English sociologist H. Spenser and the French philosopher and sociologist E. Durkheim.

Why has this type of social theory attracted attention of bourgeois sociologists? This is explained by the fact that the comparatively smooth initial stage of economic development after World War II, a certain improvement in the material position of the masses and the temporal smothering of socio-class contradictions gave birth to illusions of steady development of capitalism. In its class essence the functional conception of bourgeois sociology is directed against the Marxist theory of society which unlike it takes into consideration the antagonistic, contradictory character of the capitalist society and proves the inevitability of its revolutionary transformation.

The methodological principles of functional approach to an analysis of social phenomena is elaborated in the works of leading American sociologists Talcott Parsons, Robert Merton, Keith Davis, Marion Levy and French structuralists Claude Lévi-Strauss, Michel Foucault, R. Bart and others.

The most active apologists of functionalism and their recognised leader T. Parsons, leaning upon the ideological-theoretical heritage of the classics of bourgeois sociology M. Weber, E. Durkheim, V. Pareto, tried to elaborate, on the basis of structural-functional analysis, a profound sociological theory. According to T. Parsons, such theory should serve as an instrument of integration of numerous and isolated empiric data and lead bourgeois sociology from the deadlock of empiricism. Another group of sociologists headed

by R. Merton stresses the necessity of creating, with the help of functional analysis, of a number of limited empirically verified theories of "medium level", which should become a certain intermediate bridge between the "big" socio-logical theory and concrete empirical research.

The structural and functional approach analyses society as a strictly regulated system in its static in a certain period of time without taking into consideration the changing aspects of social being, and a man here is the passive object which adapts to the system and plays the prearranged social role invariable as to the set of norms and rules.

In their understanding of the nature of social phenomena functional sociologists proceeded from the idealistic conceptions of social life. The representatives of functionalism take for the starting point of research the socio-psychological aspects of human behaviour, in other words the subjective side of objective social processes.

The functional theory tries to escape from the solution of topical problems of modern reality, to avoid the class evaluation of social phenomena. T. Parsons openly recognised the fact that the systems and cybernetical approach were used in the theory of functionalism with the purpose of finding the way out from endless arguments about the role of class factors in determining social processes and social development.¹

In the late sixties, a new stage of development of the functional school begins. Its leading theorists now try to analyse the theoretical model of social changes and development, leaving untouched, however, the major postulates of functionalism. An important stimulus for the elaboration of the functionalist model of social change became the theoretical and practical urgency of studying the problems of "modernisation" of the Third World countries. The leading capitalist states are interested in attracting the newly-free countries

1. T. Parsons, "On Building Social System Theory. A Personal History", The Twentieth-Centuries Sciences. Studies in the Biography of Ideas, Ed. by G. Holton, New York, 1971, p. 122.

in the sphere of their economic and political influence, to press upon them the capitalist way of development. With this purpose the intensive sociological research of the countries of the Third World and the processes of technological, economic and political development begins. The new version of the structural and functional theory whose purpose is to study the process of social change and development obtains the name of "neo-evolutionism".

According to Parsons, the major stages of socio-cultural evolution are the "three widest evolutionary levels", called accordingly the primitive, the intermediate and modern ones.

In spite of the seemingly objective analysis of the processes of social change and development, T. Parsons takes a quite obvious ideological position, considering capitalist society the highest level of evolutionary development.

However, neo-evolutionists suffered a defeat in creating an all-embracing sociological theory of social change, because they could not overcome, and this is typical for bourgeois sociology, the class-political and theoretical limitations.

Marxism rejects the idealist conceptions and conservative political attitudes of structural and functional sociology, its divorce from functioning from development. But it does not deny the legitimate nature of establishing interconnections between the structure of the integral object and its functions; it neither denies the use of such categories as "structure" and "functions".

The decisive influence upon the fall of the authority of functionalism was exercised by socio-political events which took place in capitalist countries in the late sixties. The sharpening of the class struggle, the wave of student movements which swept through capitalist countries proved the fact that capitalism is not at all the static system of equilibrium, that it is subject to social and class antagonisms. The illusions of crisis-free development of capitalism in the framework of "social change" are proving to be unjustified. There grows the understanding of the fact that deep radical transformations are the major feature of social life in our times.

In recent years the attempts to combine Marxism with

various idealist trends of structuralism are being observed in bourgeois theory. The thesis that "Marxism is structuralism but historical one" is being offered,¹ that "neo-Marxism" considers the motivating force of development and disintegration of social structures to be some kind of "transindividual" subject and not class struggle. But the utilisation of these principles in the real socio-political situation demonstrates their complete insolvency.

x x x

The materialist understanding of history presents social life as the supreme form of motion of matter, uncovers the objective material foundations of the life of society, the basic laws governing the world historical process, determines the general direction and basic stages of the ascent of mankind.

In determining the general laws of social history principal attention is concentrated on the study of the major element of social being -- production of material wealth, its structure, the laws of development, interrelations of structural components; the significance of production relations as the basis of society, the interaction of the basis and the superstructure is being uncovered, the role of other elements of social being in the life of society is determined. The dialectico-materialist approach to the study of the world's phenomena means that all sides, all connections and relations are taken into consideration.

1. L. Goldman, Epistémologie et philosophia politique, Paris, 1978, p. 242.

SOCIAL CONSCIOUSNESS

The development of human society is governed by objective historical laws. However, these laws, unlike the laws of nature, work only through conscious human activity.

People guide themselves in practice by certain ideas and motives, set themselves certain goals and tasks, work out adequate means of accomplishing them, show vigour, etc. Active social consciousness is particularly important in the revolutionary struggle waged by the working people, because the mass of the working people are acting consciously and purposefully to change economic, social, political and other relations so as to build a new society which would meet the interests of the people.

An indepth understanding of the relevance of social consciousness to social practice presupposes its thorough analysis.

1. Nature and Structure of Social Consciousness

Nature of Social
Consciousness

We have already noted in analysing the genesis of social consciousness that it emerges,

takes shape and develops only in society and thanks to society. Human consciousness cannot be formed outside society or without its continuous influence. It is a social product in its very nature and will always be such as long as people live on earth. The consciousness of every individual absorbs to a larger or smaller extent everything produced by society, by humanity as a whole.

But while consciousness is essentially social, it hardly means that the consciousness of one individual does not differ in any way from that of another.

As a bearer of social consciousness, every individual at the same time adds to this consciousness something of his own, his individual views, ideals, dreams, desires, sentiments, etc. All this put together comprises individual consciousness.

Bourgeois sociologists try to regard individual consciousness (the consciousness of the individual) in isolation from social consciousness. This is a basically fallacious approach, however, because individual consciousness is the consciousness of a social individual, i.e., an individual living in society, related to a certain class, nation and environment and in this way being an ideological exponent of social, class consciousness. That is why we consider individual consciousness as the totality of all forms of reflecting social being from the angle of the individual's social needs, interests and goals. This is precisely what is considered individual consciousness in terms of the categories of dialectical materialism.

At the same time, as everyone knows, society consists of social groups, classes, nations, nationalities, etc. The consciousness of every individual contains the goals, ideals and interests which are characteristic of his social group, class and nation. This is specific in consciousness. It reflects the social being of a given social group, class, etc., its social status, its place in the system of social relations, and objective trends of development.

The general in social consciousness includes those forms of thinking, those concepts, images and notions in which all human society reflects its social being, the real objective course of social development, contradictions in social life, conflicts between antagonistic forces, the past and present of human existence, incipient possibilities and ways and tendencies of future development. The conclusion, therefore, is that the consciousness of social groups, classes, etc., as well as the general human content of consciousness constitute social consciousness representing the totality of the spiritual life of society. However, while defining the elements of consciousness related to the individuals, social groups, classes and humanity as a whole, we should not simplistically presume that these are three different types of consciousness existing independently from one another.

Consciousness is a single whole but it has different aspects and manifestations. For instance, a socialist revolution is viewed by social consciousness as a major historical event. But different classes - the working class and the

bourgeoisie - view it differently, from positions of their class interests. The former regard it as a great act of social progress, as the attainment of freedom and happiness for people, while the latter as defeat, disaster and tragedy. That is why there can be no consciousness outside or above classes in a society divided into classes. Man always reflects social being in terms of his class consciousness.

At the same time every individual perceives any event of social being through the prism of his individual consciousness, depending on how and to what extent this event affects his personal life, on his understanding of that event in accordance with his educational background, age, past experience, living conditions, etc.

Individual consciousness is an organic component of social consciousness. But social consciousness is not merely a totality of views, ideas and value orientations of individuals. It is not a mere sum total of individual consciousness but a new quality characterising a more thorough reflection of social being. Social consciousness not only reflects being at any given moment but incorporates the spiritual values accumulated by preceding generations and passed on to us in books, works of art, scientific concepts, artistic images, cultural monuments, etc. Moreover, social consciousness is a constantly developing system the components of which, including knowledge, ideals, motives, strivings, goals, values, images, concepts, etc., interact and influence one another.

Relative Independence of Social Consciousness

Having emerged on the basis of being, it is acquiring its specific features. A certain stock of concepts and notions accumulated in the course of its development actively influences the subsequent development of social consciousness. That is why, while on the whole dependent on social being, social consciousness develops relative independence, which makes itself manifest in diverse forms.

Social consciousness reflects social being but it is not a passive, morborlike reflection.

The relative independence of social consciousness is the ability of the ideological process to develop according to its intrinsic tendencies and laws, which are specific to every form of ideology but which work within the bounds of their ultimate dependence on the economy.

The material basis of the relatively independent development of social consciousness has to do with the social division of labour. The isolation of work by brain from work by hand, of spiritual activity from the creation of material values enhances the relative independence of the ideological process but is not its primary cause. The source of the relative independence of social consciousness lies in man's social activity, particularly his reflection. The active role of man's consciousness in the process of social reflection is manifest in the fact that man's mind processes and systematises the data obtained continuously by the senses and draws general conclusions from them with regard to further prospects in the development of an object or process.

How does the relative independence of social consciousness manifest itself?

First, social consciousness may lag behind the development of social being. This is explained by the fact that consciousness is a reflection of being, and reflections follow the objects and processes reflected; by the strong tenacity of old ideas and views, particularly religious beliefs, mores and customs, which survive for a long time after the disappearance of the material conditions which generated them; and also by the influence of the ideology of the reactionary class (now the bourgeoisie), which has an interest in the survival of outdated ideas and habits and therefore contributes in every way to their perpetuation.

Second, social consciousness may outpace man's practical activity. Analysing social laws and identifying the general tendencies of historical development, outstanding scholars may foretell the future, i.e., formulate theories and ideas which are considerably ahead of their time, thus pointing to mankind ways of development for dozens of years ahead. Marxism, for instance, discovered the laws of social development and scientifically proved the inevitability and necessity of transiti-

bourgeoisie - view it differently, from positions of their class interests. The former regard it as a great act of social progress, as the attainment of freedom and happiness for people, while the latter as defeat, disaster and tragedy. That is why there can be no consciousness outside or above classes in a society divided into classes. Man always reflects social being in terms of his class consciousness.

At the same time every individual perceives any event of social being through the prism of his individual consciousness, depending on how and to what extent this event affects his personal life, on his understanding of that event in accordance with his educational background, age, past experience, living conditions, etc.

Individual consciousness is an organic component of social consciousness. But social consciousness is not merely a totality of views, ideas and value orientations of individuals. It is not a mere sum total of individual consciousness but a new quality characterising a more thorough reflection of social being. Social consciousness not only reflects being at any given moment but incorporates the spiritual values accumulated by preceding generations and passed on to us in books, works of art, scientific concepts, artistic images, cultural monuments, etc. Moreover, social consciousness is a constantly developing system the components of which, including knowledge, ideals, motives, strivings, goals, values, images, concepts, etc., interact and influence one another.

Relative Independence of Social Consciousness

Social consciousness reflects social being but it is not a passive, mirrorlike reflection. Having emerged on the basis of being, it is acquiring its specific features. A certain stock of concepts and notions accumulated in the course of its development actively influences the subsequent development of social consciousness. That is why, while on the whole dependent on social being, social consciousness develops relative independence, which makes itself manifest in diverse forms.

motivate them to transform reality.

Structure of Social Consciousness

It was demonstrated in the study of dialectical materialism that the reflection of the objective world by

consciousness consists of two major phases, one sensory and the other rational cognition. The reflection of social being in social consciousness also consists of two levels, which are formed depending on the different extent to which social consciousness delves into the phenomena, processes, and relationships of social being. External events, facts and phenomena in the life of people are reflected in the senses, moods, psychological reactions and sentiments of social groups, classes, strata and nations, and are entrenched in customs, traditions, habits, etc. This level of social consciousness is known as social psychology.

A qualitatively deeper insight of social consciousness into social being is given by ideology, which reflects the internal, substantive aspects of social life, its laws and the social forces and tendencies of development that are at work. While at the socio-psychological level, consciousness reflects for the most part day-to-day and immediate interests of classes and social groups, ideological consciousness reflects the fundamental social interests and needs of a class and formulates its basic goals and its understanding of the prospects of social development. Ideology reflects social being in theories, in a system of concepts, ideas and well-developed and substantiated doctrines.

While social psychology is formed and exists at the level of everyday consciousness as a spontaneous, unorganised social phenomenon, ideology is a theoretical field, a well thought-out integral system of propositions reflecting social life. It is being developed not by a class as a whole but by its representatives, the thinkers of that class. They are ideologists, people capable of creative activity.

Social psychology and ideology are closely interrelated and have their intrinsic structure and different levels of the extent to which social being is reflected.

on from capitalism to socialism and the diversity of the forms of this transition.

Third, the relative independent development of social consciousness consists in continuity between the social ideas of every new historical period and those of past periods. Every new stage in the development of one form of social consciousness or another takes shape not only under the influence of social being, though this influence is the main factor, but also under the influence of everything positive produced by previous development.

Fourth, the relative independent development of social consciousness is manifest in the interaction of the forms of social consciousness. Each of them influences the rest of them in one way or another and is in turn influenced by them.

Fifth, this relative independence is also manifest in the fact that the forms of social consciousness are relatively independent of one another. Each of them reflects reality by its own means, draws general conclusions from this reflection in its own way, and develops according to its own laws and in its specific forms.

The intrinsic tendencies and laws of development of social consciousness differ, sometimes rather substantially, from the effect of economic tendencies and laws which have ultimately produced them and which are directed at the perception of them.

This intrinsic logic also explains why different forms of social consciousness are developing unevenly. This uneven development was manifest in human history, for instance, in the fact that different peoples at different periods developed in their spiritual life primarily religion, while other peoples at other periods attached priority to philosophy or art, and still other peoples—to science and political doctrines.

Sixth, the relative independence of social consciousness and social ideas makes itself felt particularly forcefully in the reverse influence of all forms of consciousness on the economic basis and on the development of social life as a whole. In particular, that is why social ideas are embraced by people as a guide to action, unite them and

Human consciousness has a class character in a society divided into classes.

(Man's consciousness reflects the social status of his class, relationships with other classes and social groups and the needs and interests which are common to members of his class.)

The reflection of the objective world by man is a complex and contradictory process embracing both achievements in the cognition of the world and delusions, an accurate reproduction of objective processes and errors - in short, not only the true reflection of the world but also the false, distorted, fantastic reflection in the minds of people of those external forces which dominate them.

The different forms of social consciousness -- science, philosophy, art, ethics, politics and religion -- are organically related, influence one another and cumulatively constitute social consciousness.)

Each form of social consciousness reflects social being to a different extent and therefore has a role to play both at the level of social psychology and at the level of ideology.

2. Levels of Social Consciousness

Social Psychology

Drawing a distinction between the psychological and ideological aspects of social consciousness, Marxists regard social psychology as a certain degree of the psychological condition of people, the totality of mores, feelings and sentiments, skills and emotions, customs and specific traits of character that develop in people as a result of the socio-economic conditions of their life and their vital needs and interests and that cause the spontaneous, unconscious motivation for action by the masses of people and different classes and groups.

The study of social psychology, knowledge of it and the ability to use it are one of the decisive conditions of success in leading the revolutionary struggle of the working people. Lenin pointed out on more than one occasion that even the finest of revolutionary vanguards, the most steeled party of the working class, is only a small part of the vast human sea. So the vanguard must be able to direct the will, passion,

It was demonstrated in earlier chapters that social being is multifaceted, comprising different aspects, phenomena, processes and relationships. This diversity of social life is also manifest in different forms of social consciousness.

While social psychology and ideology differ from each other in the extent to which they reflect social being, the forms of social consciousness correspond to the basic components of consciousness.

Mankind has evolved specific, most appropriate forms of reflection, and consolidated them in forms of social consciousness in order to reflect and perceive different aspects and processes of social being. These forms are a concrete expression of the basic functions and manifestations of consciousness in general as reflection of the objective world which are studied by dialectical materialism.

(Consciousness is first and foremost reflection of the objective world in man's mind.

Man reflects not only the surrounding objective world but also his internal spiritual world; he is aware of himself as a subject, mentally singles himself out of the surrounding world and perceives himself as a thinking being.

Self-awareness in social life is manifest in the fact that mankind, a class or a social group are aware of their place in the system of social relations, their tasks and historical goals.

Man not only reflects the external world and his internal spiritual world but also has a certain attitude to his knowledge and self-awareness: he has sympathies and antipathies, feels love or hatred, satisfaction or disillusionment and many other emotions.

(Consciousness reflects the world actively, selectively and forcefully rather than passively, in an impartial way. It has an element of will power in it which governs the entire process of consciousness and maintains the purposefulness, concentration and orientation of consciousness and mental activity as a whole. This aspect of human consciousness is manifest in certain principles and standards regulating human conduct, actions and relationships.

moment is most crucial in the activity of the party of the working people. It was precisely that state of social psychology that evolved in Russia in 1917. Lenin wrote at the time: "The revolutionary situation has set in in Europe. We see the greatest discontent, unrest and animosity of the masses. The revolutionary Social-Democrats must exert all their forces in order to strengthen this flow." This is the best ground for spreading proletarian ideology, educating the mass of the working people, and elevating their struggle from spontaneity to consciousness, to the level at which every worker becomes aware of his class affiliation with the great army of the proletariat of the entire nation, aware of the need to do away with the exploiting socio-economic system. In this way the highest stage in the development of social psychology is set in. It blends with ideology and absorbs scientific principles, theoretical postulates and scholarly ideas.

Ideology

Ideology incorporates views, ideas and theories in which man's relations with reality

and relations between classes and between a given class and society as a whole are realised and evaluated. It contains the goals (programmes) of social activity aimed at consolidating or changing the existing relations in society. In a society divided into classes ideology is always class-based, reflecting as it does the ideas and situation of a given class and its class interests.

The core of ideology is its theoretical content, which explains social reality and substantiates the goals and tasks of a given class. Social theory is the basis which unites the ideas, views and scientific postulates into a single integral system. That is why the ideology of a class does not arise directly from social psychology nor is a direct result of the spontaneous movement of the mass of the working people. It is a product of an indepth theoretical analysis of social development, the correlation of class forces, the objective position of the working class and its historic mission. The development of social psychology gives an impetus to the formation of ideology and provides empirical material for theoretical generalisations and a practical field in which the theoretical findings of ideology are tested.

imagination, feelings and sentiments of tens of thousands and millions of working people towards the revolutionary struggle, towards resolving the basic tasks of social life.¹ The revolution is made not by individuals and even not by the revolutionary vanguard of the working class but by the mass of the working people carried along by a single revolutionary impulse. The decisive role is played here by the state of social psychology and by the mood, purposefulness and revolutionary maturity of the working classes.

Social psychology is not anything solid, immutable, unchangeable at all times. As social being and class struggle develop, social psychology, the moods, feelings and consciousness of classes and social groups, change and develop under the influence of ideology. The following qualitative states, representing stages of progress from spontaneity to consciousness and from obedience to revolutionary struggle can be identified in the development of social psychology.

The initial steps in the development of social psychology were made against the background of the depression of people, their reconciliation with poverty and lawlessness, their being used to oppression and consent to it. The mass of people are still unable to respond to progressive ideas, and appeals for struggle draw no response from them.

Under the influence of social progress and isolated actions by progressive representatives of other classes and social groups, the gradual awakening from lethargy takes place, subconscious feelings of protest emerge, and in despair some people make isolated protests. This stage of the development of social psychology produces the breeding ground for the spread of class ideology.

The mass of people who give vent to their grievances is growing, discontent boils up, and mass-scale hatred of the existing state of affairs arises. Quantity evolves into quality, the spirit of protest breaks the fetters of habit, outrage erupts into riot and the feeling of discontent into a spontaneous movement of the mass of people. This historical

1. See V.I. Lenin, Collected Works, Vol. 31, 1974, p. 95.

The antagonism of class interests is bound to give rise to a battle of ideas, to ideological struggle. In capitalist society two ideologies which are diametrically opposite in their content, principles and methods - bourgeois and socialist ideologies - are set in opposition to each other. In our age the scope of this opposition has grown to the point of ideological confrontation of the world social forces, outgoing capitalism and ascending socialism, a progressive system ushering in a new period of world history. Lenin wrote: "...The only choice is - either bourgeois or socialist ideology. There is no middle course..."¹

One may ask, however, if ideology is bound to have a class and party character, doesn't it mean that ideology cannot at all be objective and really scientific? It may seem that every class uses every means available to it, scientific and unscientific, true and false, to prove itself right and to gain the upper hand over its ideological adversary. However, it is only representatives of that ideology which does not have an objective scientific foundation who resort to pseudo-scientific and false methods.

As a matter of fact, the present-day battle of ideas is a battle between scientific and unscientific ideologies, between the ideology corresponding to the objective laws. In this way, the question raised above can be answered as follows: there is objective, scientific ideology. It is Marxism-Leninism, because it combines scientific theory and revolutionary thought, the party spirit and the truth.

The scientific character of socialist ideology is determined by a number of factors: first, the class interests of the proletariat are not at odds with the objective cause of history but, conversely, coincide with the objective trend of historical development, with social progress which is based in our age on the transition of mankind from capitalism to socialism. For this reason the position of the working class presupposes a particularly deep-going scientific cognition of the laws and tendencies of social reality. The working class can accomplish its historic mission and meet its class

1. V.I. Lenin, Collected Works, Vol. 5, 1977, p. 384.

The founders of Marxism demonstrated that the dominant ideology in a society comprises the ideas and theories of the economically dominant class. "...The class," Marx and Engels wrote, "which is the ruling material force of society is at the same time its ruling intellectual force.... The ruling ideas are nothing more than the ideal expression of the dominant material relations..."¹

Expounding the ideas of Marx and Engels on the class character of social ideas, Lenin noted in his work What Is To be Done? that "in a society torn by class antagonisms there can never be a non-class or an above-class ideology."²

Ideology is always class-based in a society divided into classes. It represents class consciousness which reflects the social status of certain social classes and which contributes to the satisfaction of their vital interests and to the accomplishment of their tasks. Bourgeois ideologists try to present their ideology as standing outside or above classes and belonging to mankind as a whole and criticise Marxism for its supposed bias, one-sidedness and subjectiveness. In reality there is no, nor can there be ideology outside classes in a class society. The Marxist theory of the class character of ideology organically stems from the very essence of the materialist understanding of history, from its fundamental principle that social being determines social consciousness. The social being of a class society consists of the opposite classes, the exploiters and the exploited. Every class has its definite interests by virtue of its socio-economic position. Class interests are reflected in a system of ideas, in ideology, in which the goals and tasks of a given class and its views of prospects of social development are perceived and theoretically formulated. Class interests stimulate the emergence of corresponding ideas and their evolution into ideological systems and promote the realisation of these ideas.

1. Karl Marx, Frederick Engels, Collected Works, Vol. 5, 1976, p. 59.

2. V.I. Lenin, Collected Works, Vol. 5, 1977, p. 384.

class and its being. But this reflection is not one-sided, direct or immediate. Since ideology evolves as a scientific theory, it is influenced not only by the material basis, by given social being, but also to a large extent by the progress of theoretical knowledge and by ideological processes per se.

The relative independence of ideology is manifest in the fact that it may lag behind social being or outrun it, illuminating the ways and tendencies of its development.

It is because of the relative independence of ideology, because of the emergence in it of ideas, theories and scientific postulates which are not direct and immediate consequences of changes in social being that it has a reverse effect on its basis and actively influences processes in it.

Ideology not only represents reflection and cognition of social relations. It is always connected with the practical actions and conduct of people and serves the tasks of social practice. This makes its social functions, its role in social life very important. This importance makes itself felt first and foremost in the integrating and unifying role of ideology, rallying people together to accomplish the tasks facing them. Another important thing is that ideology makes forecasts and formulates goals. Its mobilising role manifests itself in its active influence. That was why the founders of Marxism pointed out that in the final analysis the social activity of the mass of people and their participation in class struggle aimed at the emancipation of the working people depends on the extent to which socialist ideology is absorbed by the mass of people, on their consciousness and awareness of their own class interests.

Ideology is an area of complex creative processes in the course of which some ideas are formulated or refuted, others revised and criticised, and still others improved and developed. Ideology is subject to the laws of continuity in the development of the spiritual life of society. Proletarian ideology absorbed, reworked and critically assimilated everything the best that had been created by major thinkers of the past in many countries.

interests only on the basis of awareness of the laws of social development. That is why one of the main tasks of the ideologists of the proletariat is scientific presentation of the objective course of social development and scientific substantiation of socialist ideology.

Second, the scientific character of socialist ideology is determined by the historical place and role of the working class in the system of social life. Dominant classes always strove to perpetuate their rule and the existing orders, thus putting a brake on social development. For this reason their theories and ideology are at variance with the objective law-governed historical process. The proletariat, meanwhile, is the only class which does not seek to perpetuate its class domination nor sets out to enslave other classes but, conversely, rids itself of exploitation and at the same time liberates from it society as a whole, takes over the means of production from private proprietors and makes them public property, thus eliminating every ground for exploitation of man by man. The working class has no interest in the perpetuation of the existing orders but tries to ensure the development, transformation and progress of society. In this way the class interests of the proletariat coincide with the objective course of historical development.

Third, it follows from the foregoing that the proletariat expresses in its activity not only its own interests but represents all the working people, all the progressive social forces of the nation as a whole. Its ideology is a concentrated scientific expression of the most vital interests, aspirations and hopes of society, the people as a whole, of everything that is live and honest in all the classes, as Lenin put it.

In this way the party spirit, the class character and scientific nature of socialist ideology are interdependent. A class position is an essential condition for scientific cognition, a compass in analysing the politics and spiritual life of society; it helps correctly to evaluate ideological trends, views and conceptions.

Ideology as the highest level of class consciousness is a reflection of the socio-economic position of a given

revolutionary struggle is replete with examples of outstanding self-sacrifices made by the best representatives of the working class because of their absolute conviction of the correctness of their cause.

A major task tackled by Marxist-Leninist ideology is struggle against bourgeois ideology, against different revisionist and opportunist deviations from Marxism-Leninism, and against different anti-socialist and anti-communist ideological trends. This task is made so important by the fact that bourgeois and revisionist ideology tries to influence the social psychology of the mass of the people and dominate it. The ideology of the dominant class in a society divided into antagonistic classes has always had a great influence on the development of everyday consciousness through the church, school, press and other channels. The brainwashing of the mass of the people has assumed a particularly large scope under conditions of present-day state monopoly capitalism. Using the press, radio, television, cinema, and mass printed matter, the monopoly bourgeoisie manipulates the consciousness of the mass of the working people by systematically affecting the minds of the people in the direction needed by the dominant class.

That is why the popularisation of Marxist-Leninist ideology among the working people necessarily presupposes struggle against bourgeois or any other related ideology and the cleansing of the minds of the working people from its influence.

One more task of socialist ideology is to develop its own theories, ideas and scientific tenets. This task is dictated first and foremost by the fact that society and socio-economic relations are continuously developing, that the world revolutionary process is rapidly advancing and that relations between countries, as well as science, technology and social production are making rapid progress. Socialist ideology must keep pace with the latest world developments and, moreover, go ahead of them, foreseeing opportunities and tendencies that arise in order to direct the revolutionary process and the activities of the multi-million mass of the working people soundly and with minimum errors.

Marxist-Leninist ideology as the ideology of the mass of the working people is performing the following main tasks.

The main task of proletarian ideology is to inculcate on the mass of the working people and their social psychology and to orient the activity of the people to the achievement of socio-political goals formulated by ideology.

The working class, the mass of the working people, cannot develop socialist consciousness in their day-to-day struggle or in their production activity. That is why it is necessary to combine the theory of socialism with the working-class movement, to introduce the ideas of socialism into the revolutionary struggle of the working people so as to impart to it a conscious, organised and purposeful character. The vanguard of the working class, its political party, is formed to carry out organisational, political and educational activities aimed at propagating Marxist-Leninist ideology in the midst of the working people.

The more favourable the ground for introducing socialist ideology in the minds of the working people and the better developed their social psychology, the greater the success in the accomplishment of that task. It is very important here to take account of the different degrees of maturity of the socio-psychological consciousness of the working people, which has already been said above. Depending on this degree, it is necessary to use different methods and forms of ideological influence on the people.

Ideology in itself, taken apart from social psychology, is pure theory, a philosophical and literary phenomenon, whereas combined with social psychology and implanted in the minds of the mass of the people it undergoes a qualitative change and becomes an active material force. Social psychology for its part is transformed qualitatively, becomes "rationalised" and incorporates certain ideas, becoming theoretically purposeful.

The vast importance of the pervasion of social psychology by ideology also consists in the fact that ideology shapes up the political views of the working people, makes them aware of the historical significance of their actions, and gives them the sense of their being right and the conviction that the cause of the working people will triumph. The history of

In bourgeois society social consciousness is "divided" into different types of class consciousness as a result of the antagonism between the interests of the ruling class and those of the oppressed class. In socialist society single social consciousness takes shape on the basis of the common interests of all the working classes conditioned by public ownership of the means of production.

Disparity between bourgeois ideology, on the one hand, and the interests of the working people and their social psychology, on the other, makes the ruling classes of bourgeois society resort to deliberate lies and hypocrisy and to cloaking their true interests. Under socialism Marxist-Leninist ideology accords with the interests of the working people and with their social psychology and aims at showing the people their true situation and tasks and at drawing the broad mass of the people into building a communist society.

The mechanism of the interaction of ideology and social psychology in bourgeois society operates on the basis of individualism, the alienation of the individual and of contrasting its interests with those of other individuals and society as a whole. In socialist society ideology and social psychology interact on the basis of collectivism and the ever growing harmony between the interests of the individual and those of groups of people and society in general.

The bourgeois political system serves as a means of implanting bourgeois ideology into the minds of the working people, distracting them from class struggle and giving them an illusion of democracy. The political system of socialist society, with the communist party playing a leading role in it, reflects the interests of the entire people and organises the building of a new society. Great importance in its work is attached to ideological work aiming at developing communist consciousness among all the working people.

Under socialism Marxist-Leninist ideology acquires special relevance and affects all aspects of social life. It tackles major tasks of a constructive nature. Communist society comes into being and develops in keeping with the objective laws of historical development, which manifest not spontaneously but consciously, through people's activity directed on a systematic basis.

The development of socialist ideology is also determined by the need to apply general Marxist-Leninist propositions to the specific conditions of individual countries and geographical regions and to the national and historical realities of individual peoples. There is nothing more remote from the truth than the allegations of bourgeois ideologists that Marxism is a conglomeration of dogmas which the Marxists are trying to impose on all the peoples without any consideration of the specific conditions of every nation. The ideology of Marxism-Leninist is scientific, it is based on historical materialism, the science of the laws of social development. The laws of any science are general and manifest themselves differently under different conditions, and the application of these general laws in every specific case is a far from easy task. For instance, specialists know well the laws of electricity but it takes much effort and ingenuity to develop a new electric device. Social life is immeasurably more complex than any piece of technology; therefore, the correct application of the general laws of social development to the specific conditions of the life of a given society, people or country is a very difficult task demanding creativity. It is the inability to accomplish this task that often leads people to renounce Marxism-Leninism, to revise it basically, to try to "improve" and "update" it, etc. Revisionists can be compared with a helpless engineer who demands a revision of the laws of electricity merely because he has failed to develop a new instrument.

Marxist-Leninist ideology is scientific and has to be approached in a scientific way.

This self-development of ideology manifests itself in practice mostly in the fact that ideologists -- people equipped in every way to develop, enrich and propagate ideology -- are being continuously educated and trained theoretically and that their skills and knowledge are being constantly improved and updated.

Social Psychology and
Ideology under Socialism

Under socialism the interaction of social psychology and ideology has the following characteristics.

Bourgeois technocratic consciousness is typical of the exploiting groups connected with production and using scientific methods of organisation and management. Petty-bourgeois technocratic consciousness can be found in certain strata of the intelligentsia, students and some groups of the working class employed in the industries depending on the scientific and technological revolution.

Finally, there is scientific, Marxist consciousness of the vanguard of the Latin American working people as represented by the communist parties of the continent and communist-gravitating elements of the general democratic movement.

The specific historical experience of capitalist industrialisation and the scientific and technological revolution in Latin American conditions as well as social changes and political struggle in the past few decades are interpreted differently by representatives of various socio-psychological groups, depending on their class characteristics.

Representatives of the right-wing traditionalist groups frown upon industrialisation, the scientific and technological revolution and any social and political change. The land-owning oligarchy which are the backbone of these groups have an idealistic view of the past, deliberately blur the difference between the imperialist and socialist ways of the scientific and technological revolution and capitalise on the negative aspects of industrialisation and the scientific and technological revolution carried out in Latin America by the exploiting groups. They try to influence the social strata with peasant-communal and petty-bourgeois consciousness. The ideologists and theorists of this trend do not flaunt their feudal convictions but manipulate the patriarchal slogans of the "indestructible national foundations" and "heritage of the forefathers" as well as certain ideas of peasant-communal and trade union "socialism" and sometimes even ultra-revolutionary phraseology.

These interpreters see the main conflict of present-day Latin American society in the contradiction between the "selfless" upholders of the "glorious" national past and a gang of alien reformists. This socio-psychological group also includes certain representatives of the petty and

Under the circumstances Marxist-Leninist ideology serves as a theoretical foundation for making scientific forecasts about the main trends in the development of socialist society. In their policy documents and resolutions of their congresses the Marxist-Leninist parties work out concrete plans for building socialism and communism, plans that guide the working people of socialist society in their practical activity.

Thus, ideology has a paramount role to play in social life and is embodied in the activities of the mass of the people, in class struggle, and in the work of political institutions and organisations implementing the political tasks of their classes. Ideology acts as a mobilising and organising force only when it penetrates social psychology, directs it and steers the consciousness of the working people towards the accomplishment of basic class tasks. Only by gripping the minds of people do ideas become a material force transforming the world.

Peculiarities of Social Consciousness in Different Geographical Regions

Peculiarities of social consciousness in the Latin American countries are determined by specific social class structure.

At present several types of consciousness can be identified here. Feudal consciousness, which was dominant in the colonial period and which has survived to this day in a slightly modernised form, is vested in major landowners and representatives of erstwhile foreign monopolies (plantation and mining ones). Peasant-communal consciousness still exists in areas of the natural economy and plantation corvée and is the breeding ground of a host of notions of "communal socialism".

Bourgeois consciousness has arisen from industrial entrepreneurship of the "laissez faire" age, and also its socio-political infrastructure, such as the officialdom, intelligentsia and clergy. Petty-bourgeois consciousness is characteristic of petty proprietors engaged in handicrafts, shop-owners and peasants dependent on the industrial system of big capital.

The pattern of social consciousness in the Arab countries is no less complex. This complexity is explained by the fact that, due to a number of historical, economic and political causes, religious ideas, clannish and tribal notions and feudal, bourgeois and petty-bourgeois ideologies are intertwined in social consciousness at different levels and in different forms. The growth of the Arab national liberation movement has enhanced nationalistic ideas and sentiments, while the numerical growth of the working class in the Arab countries has contributed to the ever wider propagation of ideas of scientific socialism in society.

The historical practice of the past few decades has demonstrated that the ideological development of the Arab revolutionary democrats has not always been consistent. In addition to certain postulates of scientific socialism, their doctrines contained quite a few petty-bourgeois and utopian religious and nationalistic ideas. Objectively, their doctrines were a programme of revolutionary action by the mass of the working people waging struggle against imperialism and reaction. But at the same time they often misled the masses, focused their attention on secondary issues, and sometimes even played right into the hands of counter-revolution and reaction.

The report of the CPSU Central Committee to the 26th Party Congress noted that "of late, Islamic slogans are being actively promoted in some countries of the East.... . The banner of Islam may lead into struggle for liberation. This is borne out by history, including very recent history. But it also shows that reaction, too, manipulates with Islamic slogans to incite counter-revolutionary mutinies."¹

The complex interlacement of divisions according to region, nationality, economic structure, class or stratum and, lastly, religion is to a large extent the legacy of the grim

1. Documents and Resolutions. The 26th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, Novosti Press Agency Publishing House, Moscow, 1981, pp. 18-19.

middle bourgeoisie who were once viewed as "progressives" and who are now being ousted by foreign and domestic monopolistic competitors well versed in the organisation of production and marketing under the conditions of the scientific and technological revolution.

The right-wing reformist groupings, which rely on bourgeoisie-technocratic consciousness, also misrepresent the basic conflict of present-day Latin American society. They attach priority to the conflict between the proponents of pro-imperialist industrialisation and scientific and technical progress and all those who are opposed to this course rather than to the basic contradiction between the forces of democracy, led by the proletariat, on the one hand, and the alliance of the reactionary forces, on the other. In this way the forces of the democratic and anti-imperialist movement are artificially lumped together with the proponents of the semi-feudal past.

Manipulating the slogans of industrialisation and the scientific and technological revolution, the ideologists of this school point to capitalist development as the only possible road to progress for Latin American countries today and summarily label all their opponents as conservatives and retrogrades rejecting economic and social progress.

Representatives of the left-wing democratic forces believe that the main conflict of the socio-economic development of Latin American countries is that between the alliance of the exploiting groups and the democratic anti-imperialist movement which must bring about radical social and political changes on the basis of industrialisation and the scientific and technological revolution in the interests of the mass of the working people. However, representatives of these forces differ in principle over the components, tasks and ways of the democratic movement, ranging from the utopian consciousness of the petty-bourgeois strata and the truly revolutionary, scientific, Marxist consciousness of the vanguard of the Latin American proletariat. Trying to win over to their side the mass of the working people, the Latin American Marxists are opposed to petty-bourgeois ultra-revolutionaries and dogmatists.

The change of the basis also entails changes in the laws of social life (the laws governing the old society give way to new laws, those that operate in a new society; the general laws of history begin to manifest themselves in a different way, and so on), the world outlook and dominant ideas change as well, etc. The basic forms of social consciousness will be examined below. It should be borne in mind here that every form of social consciousness includes many problems and aspects and is studied by philosophers and other scholars as a specific phenomenon. We will consider these forms only as forms of social consciousness that reflect certain aspects of social being.

Politics and Legal Consciousness

Politics is a form of social consciousness reflecting relations between classes, nations and other social

groups over the state and political power as a whole. The most essential element of politics is state power and hence the struggle to win, retain and utilise it. Any public activity connected, directly or indirectly, with relationships between classes, nations, states, social groups is reflected in the political form of social consciousness. All the other forms of social consciousness, including science, philosophy and art, can also have a political character if they are related to one extent or another to class relationships and state power.

Politics, just like social consciousness in general, can reflect the objective processes of social being to different degrees. That is why it manifests itself both in social psychology and ideology.

Political psychology is a totality of everyday notions, sentiments, moods and evaluations of the social status of classes and relationships between them that have been worked out spontaneously by a class or a social group. Political psychology is borne by the mass of the people and determines their behaviour to a large extent.

Political ideology is a scientific, theoretically formulated reflection of the essence and law-governed manifestations of relationships between classes, nations and social groups. It provides guidelines for the activity of classes

past of the Arab peoples, who went through Ottoman conquests and West European colonisation. The colonialists fostered the development of one-crop economies, thus encouraging the progress of some regions at the expense of others, and also supported outdated economic structures and cultural isolationism and discriminated against certain groups of the population. Finally, in the Middle East the colonialists left behind artificial borders between Arab countries.

The population of the Arab countries is very religious and almost totally illiterate. The ongoing process of industrialisation along with the spread of capitalist relations into the countryside impoverishes the poor peasantry and forces them to migrate into cities. These strata, susceptible to radicalist political demagogic, easily fall for political slogans formulated in religious terms.

3. Forms of Social Consciousness

As has been demonstrated above, the forms of social consciousness are elements, components of the spiritual life of society which reflect in specific ways the different aspects and processes of social being. The ways of reflection themselves are determined by the essential characteristics of the objects of reflection, i.e., objective processes of social life and, first and foremost, the existence of the economic basis. The relationship between forms of social consciousness also ultimately depends on relations which have emerged between objective processes of social life in the course of history. This relationship between objective processes is very complex and multifaceted. The most important point here is how closely certain phenomena and processes of social life are linked with the economic basis of society.

For instance, the social status of one class or another is directly determined by the economic basis, by the dominant relations of production in society. As the basis changes, the social status of classes changes simultaneously. It follows that politics and law have a special role to play in the system of the forms of social consciousness in a society divided into classes.

party or class is determined by the character of its domestic policy. At the same time the foreign policy situation influences domestic policy. But ultimately, both domestic and foreign policy is aimed at accomplishing the same task of preserving and consolidating the system of class, social relations existing in a given society.

The dominant class uses the state to ensconce the basic principles of its policy in the form of state laws. Law is a totality of rules of behaviour and acts established by the state, which are binding for everyone and the observance of which is ensured by measures of state influence. Law is drafted and asserted by the dominant class and for this reason is always aimed at protecting the interests of that class.

Law is an expression of the policy of the dominant class. In a society divided into classes, however, other classes have their own attitude to law asserted by the state, their own understanding of that law and their own notions of rules of behaviour. This represents legal consciousness, which is a totality of views, ideas and notions reflecting the attitude of people to law, legality, justice, and their idea of what is lawful and what is unlawful. Legal consciousness is rooted in social psychology, which includes a sense of justice, disgust for offences against the law and crimes, a sense of human dignity, comradely mutual assistance, solidarity, etc.

The legal consciousness of the mass of the working people is formulated scientifically in the policies of the Marxist-Leninist parties. Since law established by the dominant class is at odds with the legal consciousness of the mass of the working people, bourgeois law usually is hypocritical, trying to adapt itself to the legal consciousness of the working people and to conceal the fact that law gives statutory force to the dominance of one class over another. The political parties of the working people expose the hypocrisy of bourgeois law and its class nature. That is why law, just like politics, is an area of fierce ideological struggle.

Law perceived by bourgeois ideology as the unshakable basis of state order and social progress no longer constitutes the foundation of the theory and practice of state activity in the period of imperialism and particularly the

and the state. Political ideology is borne by political parties representing the interests of different classes, first and foremost their economic interests. Politics is a concentrated expression of economics, the economic position of classes and material relationships between them. At the same time politics is to a large extent relatively independent and in its turn makes a great impact on socio-historical development. Influencing political psychology, the state and political parties, politics can hold back the objective course of social development, and temporarily change relationships between classes in the interests of a certain class. It is this role that is being played today by the policy pursued by imperialism and by bourgeois political parties: it is aimed at perpetuating and extending the dominance of the big, monopoly bourgeoisie, at breaking the class unity of the mass of the working people and at consolidating imperialist domination in former colonies.

Politics plays an even more active role with regard to the economy, the material basis and social being when it is aimed at transforming society along progressive lines and contributes to social progress. Politics reflects the pressing needs of social development, first and foremost economic growth, and acts as a strong accelerator of social progress and as a force contributing to the rational and efficient utilisation of the potentialities latent in the objective course of social processes. It is this role that is being played in our age by the policies of the Marxist-Leninist parties, expressing the interests of the working class and all the working people. Reflecting the objective laws of relationships between classes and their development, the policies of the communist and workers' parties grip the political psychology of the mass of the population and direct their actions at radical social reforms, at establishing new relationships between classes, social groups and nations, and at building a new society.

Relationships between classes, nations and social groups are to be found not only within an individual country but also outside it. That is why we identify foreign and domestic policies. On the whole, the foreign policy of a given state,

ral erudition, mature ideological and moral principles, a profound and comprehensive understanding of the relationship between social and individual interests, a high level of civic and state consciousness, awareness of their responsibility for their actions both at work and in relations with other people. This highly developed political culture has been evolved by the socialist way of life, which is a process of the development of a new type of the individual who has firm and mature ideological principles, is active in social life, and not merely absorbs the basics of knowledge and culture but, coming into contact with the highest spiritual values of world and present-day socialist culture, transforms them into his innermost ideological convictions.

The political culture of socialism is aimed at fostering in society a spiritual and moral atmosphere characterised by high demands on the norms of communal life in socialist society and at drastic measures to overcome negative phenomena in practice. It is directed first and foremost against bourgeois ideology and morality, against everything hampering the assertion of social justice, creative work and human dignity.

Philosophy

Philosophy as a form of social consciousness is the subject of discussion and analysis in this book as a whole. That is why there is no need to dwell in detail on this question here. It should be pointed out, however, that philosophy always is a concentrated presentation of the theory about the more general principles of knowledge and human consciousness, human being and the place and role of man in society. The fundamental question of philosophy, the question of the relationship of thinking towards being, is essentially the question of man, his place in the world and his attitude to it.

Answers to the fundamental question of philosophy and other questions posed by it and the interpretation of the principles mentioned above was changing in the course of history and had different meaning in different epochs. Marx observed, therefore, that every "philosophy is the intellectu-

general crisis of capitalism. Under conditions of present-day capitalism political views and legal consciousness are reflecting to an ever greater extent the crisis of the legal methods of governing society, the crisis of the notions of legality and democracy as intrinsic elements of the bourgeois state.

As it wages a class struggle, the working class evolves socialist, revolutionary legal consciousness, which is manifest in the programmes of the workers' parties, in the political and legal demands of the mass of the population and in their protest against the existing orders.

Socialist legal consciousness is a totality of legal views, notions and social sentiments expressing the attitude of the working class and the working people at large, led by the communist party, to the existing system of duties, rights and responsibilities of citizens.

Socialist legal consciousness is characterised by ideas of internationalism, friendship among nations and their equality. It is based on the recognition of the fact that law should promote fraternal cooperation among nations and their drawing closer together and cross-fertilisation. Socialist legal consciousness is pervaded with genuine humanism: man is the greatest asset of society. It ensures and promotes the development of human freedom, dignity and honour. The humane character of socialist legal consciousness is manifest in the fact that it encourages such forms of the self-realisation of the individual which contribute to the flourishing of his creative potentialities and to the spiritual enrichment of people around him.

As a result of the further progress of law in socialist society, every member of that society will not go beyond the bounds of the existing legal norms but make his choice in his social actions and behaviour exclusively on the strength of his inner need rather than by force of coercion. This will be an essential prerequisite for the abolition of the coercive function of legislation and gradual transition to communist social self-government.

The overwhelming majority of people under developed socialism are characterised by extensive political and cultu-

revolution, establishes its own rule and pursues its specific class interest, and its philosophy, therefore, becomes the concentrated expression of its class consciousness.

The working class is the only class which does not pursue in its revolutionary struggle the aim of establishing its class dominance over the other classes, but, conversely, emancipating itself liberates society as a whole and sets out to abolish any exploitation of man by man, to do away with the division of society along class lines, and to build a classless society in which the free development of everyone is the condition of the free development of all. That is why the working class is the most consistent representative of the interests of society as a whole, looking into its future, while its philosophy, Marxism-Leninism, is the only scientific and true philosophy, the concentrated expression of the whole of human consciousness and the cultural and intellectual quintessence of our age, the age of mankind's transition from capitalism to socialism, the overthrow of colonialism and victorious national liberation revolutions.

Philosophy performs several basic functions in society. Being the intellectual and cultural quintessence of its age, philosophy first and foremost constitutes the basis of world outlook. The world outlook is a system of views on the world, surrounding reality, nature and society in the past, at present and in the future, which gives a coherent understanding of the developments taking place in the world.

The fact that Marxist-Leninist philosophy is the basis of the world outlook of all the progressive forces of our time is explained by its coherent approach to an analysis of reality, its interest in the general laws of nature, society and thought, its view of human activity as an integral whole and its concentrated expression of the consciousness of the most progressive class.

The world outlook is not only a definite system of knowledge but also the convictions, goals and principles of action by social classes and their parties. It includes a certain set of values by which the progressive classes guide themselves in their revolutionary transforming activity.

al quintessence of its time."¹

Mankind seems to be summing up its intellectual and cultural development in philosophical doctrines at every period of history, understanding itself, clarifying the extent to which it has come to realise its place in the surrounding world, the path travelled in history and tendencies for further development. That is why philosophy can be defined as an historically conditioned self-awareness of mankind, its understanding of its own nature, goals, tasks and possibilities.

The history of philosophy as a whole is the history of struggle between different schools seeking to express the self-awareness of mankind. But since philosophers in societies divided into classes always represented, whether consciously or subconsciously, the interests of certain classes, their doctrines were the quintessence of the self-awareness of only those classes which were represented by philosophers in question.

Does this mean that there can be no genuine philosophy in a class society? No, it does not.

This matter is related to the understanding of social progress. The world historical process, as was demonstrated above, advances by means of revolutionary transition from one socio-economic formation to another. The class carrying out a revolution aimed at eliminating outdated social relations and establishing new ones objectively expresses the interests of human society as a whole. "The class making a revolution comes forward from the very start, if only because it is opposed to a class, not as a class but as the representative of the whole of society, as the whole mass of society confronting the one ruling class. It can do this because initially its interest really is as yet mostly connected with the common interest of all other non-ruling classes..." Marx pointed out.² That is why the philosophy of that class indeed is the quintessence of human consciousness as a whole and represents relative truth for its period.

However, history shows that every class, having made a

-
1. K. Marx, F. Engels, Collected Works, Vol. 1, 1976, p. 195.
 2. K. Marx, F. Engels, Collected Works, Vol. 5, 1976, pp. 60-61.

sophy of the working class manifests itself. Philosophy serves quite definite aims, mainly, the cognition of the world with a view to purposefully transforming it. That is why the role of Marxism-Leninism constantly grows just as the revolutionary and liberation struggle of the working people of the world grows in depth and scope.

In this way philosophy as a form of social consciousness reflects man's being, his place in the objective world, his attitude to the surrounding reality and to himself, and at the same time his basic stand in life, convictions, ideals and value orientations.

Philosophy as the basis of the world outlook pervades both levels of social consciousness, that is, social psychology and ideology. The world outlook and its philosophical underpinnings exist in social psychology in the form of common sense, i.e., the totality of people's day-to-day experience, views, and traditional notions of the surrounding world and themselves that evolve spontaneously. This philosophical world outlook at the level of social psychology can be materialist, when the world is viewed as it presents itself to man, or idealistic, more often than not religious, when man sees in every natural process or his own action a manifestation of some supernatural force. This view of the world is most often a mixture of naive materialist and religious notions of oneself and of the world around.

The philosophical world outlook is to be found for the most part at the level of ideology in systematised philosophical doctrines, which exist in the form of concepts, rely to one extent or another on the achievements of the natural and social sciences and are corroborated to a certain degree by logical arguments.

Man's world outlook has a great role to play in the life of society because it supplies man with certain guidelines for his behaviour in society and his relation to other classes, nations and social groups. That is why different schools of philosophy are engaged in bitter struggle in their attempts to foster in the mass of the population a world outlook in which the classes represented by them have an interest. It is quite important from the point of view of class struggle today whether man sees himself as a solitary being, desola-

In this way the world-view aspect of philosophy produces an additional criterion for the selection and evaluation of the material, object, methods and ways, direction and tasks of actions of the progressive forces, the criterion of values. Marxist-Leninist philosophy regards man as the supreme value and the innermost meaning of history as a whole. Herein lies the profound humanism of the philosophy of the working class and also its historical optimism, because philosophy sets out not only to explain the world and man's place in it but, what is most important, to change that world in accordance with man's vital interests. Explaining the general laws of the development of nature, society and thought, philosophy shows that people themselves make their history and, therefore, are masters of their future, which depends on the extent of their revolutionary transforming activity. The philosophical world outlook points out for man certain values in his activity and in this way constitutes the methodological basis of the cognition and understanding of the world and practical activity. The more general laws of development of nature, society and human thought, explained by Marxist-Leninist philosophy, are the point of departure for further scientific cognition and a guide directing thinking towards more thorough and accurate investigation and practical activity towards the scientific and revolutionary transformation of the world in accordance with objective laws.

Dialectical materialism demonstrates its strength and magnitude particularly forcefully when its basic functions, those of a scientific world outlook and methodology, are combined in an unbreakable unity rather than taken separately and when philosophy is understood as knowledge of the more general laws of the world, lying at the basis of world outlook and constituting the methodology of cognition and action. This role can be played only by the philosophy of a progressive class which transforms the world by means of revolution. Marxism-Leninism, a consistently scientific philosophy, is a creative revolutionary doctrine laying down clear guidelines for the working class and all the working people to radically transform the world. It is in this that the organic unity of the scientific and partisan character of the philo-

its moral vices.

Marx pointed out this circumstance on more than one occasion: "... Shame is already revolution of a kind... Shame is a kind of anger which is turned inward. And if a whole nation really experienced a sense of shame, it would be like a lion, crouching ready to spring."¹ The awareness that their cause is morally right gives the revolutionary classes "the insuperable pathos of moral forces" (Marx), and inspires them with the conviction of ultimate victory and the triumph of a new social system based on the principles of humanism. That is why the formation of a lofty moral consciousness as a component of the overall ideological training of revolutionaries is an important task of every Marxist-Leninist party.

The moral reflection of reality is characterised by the following specific features:

The object of moral reflection is what is deontological (binding) in society. Moral norms reflect the demands made by society and social classes on the younger generation and on the behaviour of people in general. These demands are understood by man as his social duty, i.e., certain obligations to the homeland, class, party, collective, family, etc. A specific feature of the moral awareness of these obligations is that they are not something imposed from outside but something intrinsic to the internal motivation of the individual. This does not mean, however, that moral ideas or feelings are in-born. Moral rules become man's internal motivation as a result of education and the assimilation by him of the traditions, customs and mores of society.

Making certain moral requirements on the individual, the society or a class backs them by public opinion. The impact of public opinion here depends not only on the significance of moral evaluation but also on the fact that it usually entails certain actions. Moral consciousness, therefore, reflects both the measure of the requirements made by society on people and the measure of their spiritual reward for their actions. That is why moral consciousness is to a considerable

1. K. Marx, F. Engels, Collected Works, Vol. 3, 1975, p.133.

te and oppressed by alien forces he cannot understand, living in constant fear and expecting death, as existentialism presents it, or whether man is aware of his close unity with his fellow men, capable of cognising and transforming the world, doing good to people and making a contribution towards bettering social life and the development of science, culture and social production, as Marxism, a philosophy of historical optimism, demonstrates.

Morality

Morality is a system of views, principles and rules, and also moods and sentiments by which people guide themselves in relationships with one another and with society both in personal and public life and in raising the younger generation. As any other form of social consciousness, it has two levels, moral psychology and moral ideology.

Moral psychology is a totality of moods, views, traditions and customs regulating the behaviour of people in day-to-day life with the help of public opinion. The strength of public opinion lies in the fact that it is a concentration of the prestige of a social group, making it obligatory for people to observe certain moral rules.

Moral feelings of love and hatred, courage and cowardice, elation and outrage, etc., are not a consequence of man's biological development. The content of these feelings is shaped up in the course of social development under the impact of society, a class and the family. They dominate all the other emotions and feelings of man. Moral feelings are far more stable than other feelings.

Moral ideology is reflected in ethical systems of different types which exist in specific historical circumstances and have a class nature.

Moral consciousness is a sensitive indicator of the behaviour of large groups of people. It also gives a strong impetus to the social activity of millions of people. It is common knowledge, for instance, that the political demise of the outgoing classes departing from the historical scene is inevitably accompanied by their moral degradation. Ideological preparations for a social revolution include, along with political criticism of the outdated system, the exposure of

Communist morality is fundamentally different from any morality of the exploiting classes, particularly bourgeois morality. It includes moral principles of general human value which the mass of the working people evolved in their struggle against the exploiters and their moral vices. Communist morality emerged way back under capitalism, when it expressed the protest of the proletariat against exploitation and inequality and its striving to assert the rules of human society on the basis of relations of friendship, comradeship, cooperation and mutual assistance.

Communist morality, Lenin pointed out, is subordinate to the interests of the class struggle waged by the proletariat. "Communist morality is based on the struggle for the consolidation and completion of communism."¹ The basic demand of communist moral consciousness is struggle for communism and subordination of one's behaviour to this struggle. This demand is an objective criterion of the moral evaluation of human behaviour.

What are the specific features of communist morality? One of the distinctive characteristics of communist morality is the fact that its demands, related to the struggle for communism, coincide with historical necessity and reflect to the fullest possible degree the objective law-governed progress of present-day society.

Another characteristic of communist morality is its reflection of the interests of the majority in today's society. It is first and foremost the working class that has an interest in building communism. Waging struggle for its own liberation, the working class strives to emancipate labour from any exploitation and to eliminate any oppression of the working people, who sooner or later realise this fact and join forces with the working class. For this reason the role of communist moral consciousness in the life of society grows immeasurably.

It is an important aspect of communist morality that it rests on a solid scientific basis. While the theoretical foundation of bourgeois morality is idealism, communist morality relies on dialectical and historical materialism.

¹ V.I. Lenin, Collected Works, Vol. 31, 1974, p. 295.

lutionary or reactionary - it reflects. At any historical stage that moral consciousness is genuine which upholds the future and reflects the objective needs of the progressive development of society.

Undoubtedly, when capitalism was superceding feudalism and from the point of view of history was a more progressive system than feudalism, bourgeois moral consciousness was relatively in accord with the historical requirements of that period and therefore was more progressive than Christian feudal consciousness.

In our age, communist morality is the only true moral consciousness, not merely because of the subjective wish of the Communists. The Communists are against moral relativism. It is genuine because its requirements correctly reflect the needs of the historical development of present-day society, the advance from capitalism to communism.

Progress in the field of morality in a class society is effected through the struggle of the revolutionary classes with the reactionary forces of society. The moral consciousness of every dominant class was historically relatively progressive from the point of view of history only at a certain stage of historical development, when the interests of that class temporarily coincided with the interests of the mass of the people, with the interests of social development as a whole. It is the exploited, working masses rather than the exploiting classes that have always been the vehicles of moral progress.

The objective criterion of moral progress, therefore, lies in the struggle for the liberation of the working people. Marxists believe that every means serving the cause of liberation from oppression and exploitation is moral. Moral progress is evidenced by morality becoming more humane, by the filling of moral categories with democratic and humane content, and by the preservation of the positive achievements of the preceding development of morality. The simpler norms of morality have been evolved throughout the previous epochs, first and foremost, by the working people with their lofty moral values and that is why they have become a part of communist morality.

were "most manly, noblest, most worthy of sympathy."¹

Real socialism has created every condition for the most humane norms of morality to become the unshakable everyday principles and rules of conduct of the individual. Of course, the development of the individual of a new type is not an act of the instantaneous transmutation of man but a complex, long and sometimes rather contradictory process. The new man is developed in the course of the direct participation of working people in tackling the socio-political, economic, intellectual and cultural problems of building communism.

As society advances towards communism, the area in which relationships between people are regulated by methods of administration will keep narrowing, while the impact of the moral factor will constantly grow. Lenin wrote: "Only in communist society ... people will gradually become accustomed to observing the elementary rules of social intercourse that have been known for centuries and repeated for thousands of years in all copy-book maxims. They will become accustomed to observing them without force, without coercion, without subordination, without the special apparatus for coercion called the state."²

Science

Science as a form of social consciousness is objective and systematised knowledge

about the essence of natural and social phenomena and processes. Science consists of knowledge which is logically systematised and pervaded with a definite world outlook. The subject-matter of science is nature, society and thought. Science reflects the world in concepts, categories and laws, the veracity of which has been corroborated by social practice.

Science has a number of specific characteristics.

First, it has many objects. Unlike such forms of social consciousness as, for instance, political consciousness,

1. K. Marx, F. Engels, Collected Works, Vol. 4, 1976. p. 502.

2. V.I. Lenin, Collected Works, Vol. 25, p. 462.

Trying to besmirch Communists, bourgeois ideologists are trying to discredit in every way the concept of social revolution in the eyes of the mass of people. The egoism of the bourgeoisie as a class prevents it from realising the true moral values of social revolution and its role and place in the social and moral progress of mankind. They consider it immoral of the Communists first and foremost to recognise the need for revolution as the only means of emancipating the working people from exploitation and oppression.

However, it is in a revolution that the more valuable moral qualities of its participants manifest themselves. The best sons and daughters of the people, willing to sacrifice their lives for the ideals of social justice and for the happiness of others, rise in struggle. At the same time revolutionary struggle itself with its spirit of selfless and dedicated service to the common cause contributes to the fullest possible realisation of the moral potentialities of participants in it.

During the backlash of counter-revolution, as historical experience shows, the reactionary class casts aside its camouflage of virtue and morality, with which it shamefully covers its egoistic interests during the relatively peaceable periods of its dominance. Mass-scale brutality, torture and humiliation are the usual methods of "pacification" employed by victorious bourgeois counter-revolutionaries. In this sense the examples of Chile, El Salvador and South Africa are far from isolated. The rampage of immorality and misanthropy, which is an invariable companion of all the reactionary movements of our century, culminated in the theory and practice of fascism and grew to appalling dimensions threatening the existence of mankind.

The class struggle of the proletariat is the greatest and most noble struggle in human history. The ultimate end of the communist movement figures in the moral consciousness of the proletariat as a supreme moral ideal, whose main content is the freedom of the individual and the freedom of society. Proletarian revolutionaries have displayed in the struggle for attaining it the greatest models of moral integrity, strength and purity. As Engels put it, these qualities

itself from concrete sensory aspects of reality and from particular characteristics of phenomena. The work of a researcher has, of course, emotional and psychological aspects, too, but science itself is the domain of logic and reason.

Scientific progress is characterised by two major tendencies. One of them is the growing differentiation of knowledge. As production and science make progress, new areas appear in different fields of knowledge and some of them grow into independent sciences. For instance, physics, biology, history and economics today actually are complexes of related scientific disciplines.

Differentiation of scientific knowledge is born of the need to learn about poorly researched or unknown phenomena of reality. The objective basis of differentiation of scientific knowledge is the diversity of the world, of the forms of motion of matter, and also the fact that the development of cognition itself has no bounds.

The other tendency makes itself manifest in the integration of knowledge. The progress of science also shows that, in addition to the branching off of new sciences from traditional ones, there constantly take place integration of knowledge and special sciences emerge at the junction of old, traditional sciences (e.g., biochemistry, biophysics, physical chemistry, mathematical logic, economic geography, etc.).

The objective basis of the integration and synthesis of scientific knowledge is the unity of the basic properties and laws of matter in motion. Major factors contributing to this process are the evolution of integral scientific theories with common methodological principles and laws, and the emergence of new scientific disciplines at the junction of two or more sciences, which have come to be known as interdisciplinary sciences.

Both these tendencies have made themselves felt particularly forcefully during the past few decades. Being directly opposed to each other and in a sense even mutually exclusive, they interact in the process of the advance of science.

At present science undergoes substantial and relatively rapid changes of a qualitative as well as quantitative nature.

legal consciousness, morality and art, science reflects not this or that aspect of the objective world but tries to embrace as thoroughly as possible all the aspects of nature, society and human thought. That is why it supplies knowledge, which plays the role of objective truth, to society as a whole, from production to the more abstract forms of intellectual activity.

Second, science has an investigative nature. Its activity stems from its very purpose, from the fact that it has to teach people how to do what they want to do. Science cannot be understood out of the context of practical human activity and a search for the more rational ways of accomplishing the tasks facing society. This means that every specific science, if it is to correspond to its purpose, must be not merely a scientific system or theory explaining the world but also a means and method of changing and transforming that world.

Third, from the point of view of its social role science is the principal means of cognising reality. All the forms of social consciousness reflect reality but it is in science alone that the function of cognition is the main function, wholly determining the nature and specific features of this vast and important area of the spiritual life of society. Lenin wrote in his Materialism and Empirio-criticism: "...The purpose of science is to present a true picture of the world..."¹

This purpose forcefully makes itself manifest in the striving of science to lay bare and thoroughly understand the nature of phenomena and what is general in them and to formulate the law-governed patterns thus cognised in the form of conclusions. This is what makes science different, for instance, from artistic cognition, which supplies knowledge about the general through the individual in the form of concrete sensory images.

In performing its main social function, science reflects reality in logical concepts and laws and usually abstracts

1. V.I. Lenin, Collected Works, Vol. 14, p. 171.

tration of the scientific forces and financial resources provided by the state budget first and foremost for the development of new weapons systems and means of mass destruction; and in the ruthless competitive struggle between concerns and companies engaged in research and development. All this shows that science has been enslaved by capital and that scientific output has become a commodity. The owners of "scientific commodities" use them directly in the struggle for dominance within capitalist countries and on the world scene.

The capitalist type of relationship between politics and science is effectively countered today by the progressive and historically promising type of socialist scientific politics. The 60 years of the development of the Soviet state have thoroughly corroborated the efficiency and humanism of the political programme for the radical restructuring of science in socialist society that was developed by Lenin and confirmed his prediction that socialism would liberate science from bourgeois fetters, from enslavement by capital, and from servitude to the interests of filthy capitalist greed.

The policy of the communist party in socialist society is based on recognition of the growing role of science in the life of society and in accomplishing the historic task of meeting the material and cultural needs of all members of society.

Art

Art is a special form of social consciousness reflecting reality in artistic images.

It is a totality of feelings, sentiments, views and theories expressing the aesthetic relations of people to nature and to one another. It includes artistic tastes, views, evaluations and ideas in which the state of harmonious unity and satisfaction or conflict and alienation in man's relationships with his environment are reflected and emotionally expressed.

Art has two structural levels, ideological, including works of art and aesthetic theories, and psychological, including the amateur artistic activity of people, folklore,

This development of science has been justly characterised as the scientific revolution.

Karl Marx predicted more than a century ago that science would become a productive force. Today we see quite clearly the new qualities and characteristics of the development of science as a productive force. Scientific knowledge becomes embodied in technology and know-how, in the material conditions of production, in the creative activity of participants in it, and in the principles of organisation and management of production and society. Being an organic component of the productive forces, science participates in the development of the most important productive force, man, with his labour, production and social relations.

The transformation of science into a direct productive force is a complex and contradictory process, which assumes different forms under capitalism and socialism. When objectivised and materialised, knowledge can become under capitalism a force alienated from man and oppressing him. The latter circumstance enables the monopoly bourgeoisie to use knowledge and new scientific discoveries for anti-human purposes, for instance, to manipulate people and to enslave them spiritually (total control, etc.).

The reactionary influence of imperialist policy on science has fostered such a pernicious process in the latter which can be considered a crisis and even, as Western scientists themselves admit, as "the irreversible erosion of scientific ethics." Science is becoming increasingly dehumanised and its achievements are used for militaristic and pragmatic purposes to an ever growing extent under the influence of the political rule of capital, with the degeneration of scientific ethics being an inevitable result. The impact of the policy of capitalist society on science fosters moral corruption among scientists and eventually results in the gloomy pessimism and inevitable decline of the intellectual forces.

The character of bourgeois politics in science and its major tendencies manifest themselves in the growing monopolisation of science, at a level exceeding the level of monopolisation in production today; in the subordination of the scientific potential to monopoly policy; in the concen-

and particular phenomenon, whereas concepts convey what is intrinsic, essential and general. The specific character of an artistic image is precisely that it is a form of cognising the general through the particular.

The artistic image focuses what is the main, essential and particularly specific in phenomena of reality and expresses it in an inimitably individualised form. This artistic image is known as typical in art. The typical is the generalisation of not any random characteristics and properties found in a range of phenomena but of only those which express the nature of these phenomena and their essence.

There are two types of artistic images: 1) visual images, used in painting, the theatre, and cinema, when images are an immediate presentation of living phenomena; 2) and expressive images, used in literature and music, when artistic images are created in a mediated form, through influencing man's imagination.

Artistic images are created by means of artistic form. The form of a work of art is its internal and external organisation, which is created with the help of material expressive means which are specific to every form of art and which brings out, fixes and expresses the message of a given work of art. The methods and techniques of organising form, evolved in the process of the long development of artistic practice, have the force of objective laws. Disregard for these specific laws and attempts to break them are bound to lead to creative failures.

Art is subdivided into different forms depending on the specific features of reflection of different aspects, of the objective world by them and the characteristics of the artistic expressive means they use. The main forms of art are literature, music, the theatre, painting, architecture, sculpture and cinema. The forms of art in their turn are subdivided into genres. In literature, for instance, we identify poetry and prose, and in cinema feature and documentary films.

The social function of art is to meet the aesthetic needs of people by creative works of art. Art improves the aesthetic perceptions of man, adds to his emotions, enriches his artistic notions, etc. In short, art forms artistic tastes

fashions, everyday artistic activity, etc.

Works of art always represent a result of the modification of reality by man in accordance with his ideas of beauty. They are a material representation of man's aesthetic approach to objective reality. That is why art can also be defined as a form of the artistic assimilation of reality by man in accordance with his aesthetic ideal.

The specific character of art, just as of any other form of social consciousness, is determined by the object and form of reflection and also by its special social role or function.

The object of art is the activity of man in society according to "the laws of beauty" (Marx). Since this activity is diverse, art embraces the entire diversity of the world of objects. The object of artistic reflection is not merely activity according to the laws of beauty but reality as a whole from the point of view of this activity. The animal and plant kingdoms, mountains, seas, and man-made objects become meaningful in art only when man's aesthetic approach to the world manifests itself in them.

We should distinguish between the object of art and its content, determined not only by the specific characteristics of reality it reflects, but also by the characteristics of the artistic view of the world. The content of a work of art necessarily includes not only the objective facts of reality but also the subjective aspects of the artist's world outlook. It always supplies a picture of definite aspects of reality and objectivises the inner world of man creating works of art according to the laws of beauty. This, in particular, explains the fact that different artists portraying the same phenomena create works of art which are vastly different from the point of view of their content.

The main specific feature of art is connected with the type of reflection that is characteristic of this form of social consciousness. Reflection is effected in it in artistic images.

The artistic image is a reflection of what is most essential in phenomena through the individual in a concrete sensory form. It cannot be identified either with sensations or concepts. Man's sensations reflect the immediate, single

Schiller, Goethe, and Hegel observed in their time. The scientific explanation of this phenomenon was supplied by Marxism. Having made an indepth analysis of the capitalist mode of production, with its single interest in profit-making, Marx came to the conclusion that "capitalist production is hostile to ... art and poetry".¹

Present-day bourgeois art is pervaded with the spirit of pessimism, degradation and disintegration. It reflects the bourgeoisie's fear of imminent peril and bears the imprint of doom. This art is immoral, and its entire theory and practice are undemocratic, devoid of principles and ideals, misanthropic, nationalistic, racist, and call for armed ventures and colonial conquests.

Alongside with modernism, which is art for the elite, meeting the needs of an insignificant minority of society, and widespread in the bourgeois world is what is called pop art with its huge armoury of productions which are downright deception rather than genuine art.

Of course, art in capitalist countries is not limited to these tendencies. There is a strong democratic trend which effectively struggles against reactionary and degrading bourgeois art under difficult conditions. Many progressive artists, among them Renato Guttuso, Herluf Bidstrup, Stanley Cramer, Erve Basin, Ingmar Bergman, and Federico Fellini, raise and resolve at a high artistic level serious and vital problems of our age.

Art is developing under difficult conditions in countries which have shaken off the yoke of colonial dependence. Colonialism did incalculable damage to the enslaved peoples, held back their economic and social progress for centuries, destroyed centres of ancient civilisations, suppressed culture, adversely affected the development of art, and warped the aesthetic consciousness of those peoples in many respects. The cultural decolonisation of the newly-free countries will take much time and effort and many problems will have to be resolved.

1. Karl Marx, Theories of Surplus-Value, Part I, Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1975, p. 285.

of people, in accordance with which everyone does creative work according to the laws of beauty in his specific area of activity and thus brings beauty into life.

Art plays a great role in the life of society. It helps people to understand the world better. Its cognitive role consists in the fact that people can more thoroughly and comprehensively understand specific historical circumstances, social relations and political interests through certain artistic images created by an artist or a writer.

Art is very important to education. It influences by artistic means the senses, will and thinking of man in accordance with definite ideological guidelines. In this way it contributes to the development of the social profile of man, his character and willpower. Advanced, progressive art always is a great motive force in changing old, outdated social relations and contributes to the substitution of new, advanced relations for them.

It follows that the social role of art is defined by its attitude to revolutionary struggle and the revolutionary transformation of the world, by its class position. Art which expresses the interests of the advanced classes, the people, and the objective needs of the time is progressive. Art which is in the service of the reactionary classes is reactionary.

Opponents of Marxism-Leninism claim that art is presumably "extra-class" and that workers in art are "free" and "independent" in their actions. In reality, however, there can be no extra-class art in a society divided into antagonistic classes. Lenin wrote: "One cannot live in society and be free from society. The freedom of the bourgeois writer, artist or actress is simply masked (or hypocritically masked) dependence on the money-bag, on corruption, on prostitution."¹

The destinies of art are different in today's world. It is affected by a deep-going crisis in capitalist countries. The bourgeois spirit of money-grubbing is alien to art, as

1. V.I. Lenin, Collected Works, Vol. 10, p. 48.

le against the vestiges of the 'old world', its degrading influence, and at eradicating these phenomena. But its main task is to encourage a socialist, revolutionary understanding of the world and disposition."¹

Under conditions of socialism the method of socialist realism demands that criticism never encourage a sceptical and pessimistic attitude to reality nor call in question the possibility of overcoming the existing difficulties and building communist society. That is why a positive hero is the main protagonist in works of art of socialist realism.

Unlike the positive hero in the works of art of critical realism, who stood in opposition to the exploiters' society and struggled against it, the positive hero of socialist art is organically connected with the society in which he lives and struggles for its prosperity, might and future.

Socialist art carries on the traditions of the advanced art of the past, assimilates and creatively enriches them, and creates a new, socialist artistic culture. The method of socialist realism in art is the continuation and development of the best traditions of the realist art of the past and means the truthful artistic representation of reality in specific historical circumstances and in revolutionary development. It expresses the aspirations, humanism and optimism of all the working people.

Socialist art is an important stage in the development of realistic art. It carries on and develops such features of that art as close links with life, the truthful reproduction of typical characters in typical circumstances, and the portrayal of the general through the particular. What makes socialist art different from realistic art is a more indepth portrayal of phenomena, communist aesthetic ideals and the impassionate assertion of what is new. The creative potentialities of socialist realism have been confirmed by many outstanding works of art. The method of socialist realism opens up before workers in any form of art broad vistas for free creative work in the interests of the people, and provides ample room for diverse genres, styles and artistic

1. Literaturnaya gazeta, June 17, 1954.

The art of socialist countries is in the forefront of the world artistic process. Socialism has rid art of many factors which are pernicious to its development. In particular, it put artistic and cultural values within the reach of the mass of people by abolishing the monopoly right of the formerly dominant minority to culture and excluding the possibility of culture being regarded as a luxury, and also freed the artist from the anarchy of private interests. In this way proper conditions were provided for the genuine flourishing of socialist art, and the unheard-of upsurge of art of the formerly oppressed peoples of Russia bears evidence to this fact.

The art of socialist society is the highest stage in the development of aesthetic consciousness. It emerged on the basis of the revolutionary activity of the working class and by right inherited and absorbed everything of the best that has been created in the history of mankind. The characteristic features of socialist art include truthfulness, humanism, optimism and the belief in the bright future of mankind. Its major characteristic is the fact that its theoretical basis is dialectical materialism and its main creative method - socialist realism.

Socialist realism is an artistic method consisting in the ability to evaluate the present from positions of the scientifically projected future, to reveal the shoots of this future in the surrounding reality and to portray it in an artistic form. The method of socialist realism was founded by Maxim Gorky.

In the past, realism was mostly critical. It was quite natural, since great artists living under conditions of the exploiting system exposed the injustice and oppression that reigned supreme in the society of the time. Their main task was to destroy the old world. Naturally, they portrayed shoots of the future but laid main emphasis on criticism, on exposing the old world.

Socialist realism is similarly critical of, revolutionary and hostile towards, everything outdated. However, it attaches priority to a constructive function, the demonstration of the superiority and wealth of new realities created by the people. Maxim Gorky wrote: "Socialist realism seeks to struggle

daily life".¹ The system of religious notions is, therefore, characterised by the illusory and inadequate nature of its reflection of reality and by the expression of man's impotence before the dominance of objective reality. It is these most important characteristics that express the nature of religion and distinguish it from scientific world outlook.

Religion has deep social roots. It is a "warped world outlook" born of the "warped world", the self-consciousness and self-awareness of man who "has either not yet found himself or has already lost himself again".² If the individual is impotent to influence the alienated natural or socio-cultural environment, be it in primitive society or in present-day bourgeois society, there appear favourable conditions for fetishism, which means belief in the supernatural properties of material objects and relations.

There are different forms of fetishist consciousness. Primitive fetishism consisted in the worship of the forces of nature as an illusory means of harnessing them. Latter-day fetishism means the deification of anarchic social forces: man under capitalism deifies the social environment which suppresses him.

Non-Marxist authors pointed out on more than one occasion that religion, even in its most elementary forms of primitive totemism or "children's fetishism", elevates man above his sensuality, presumably bridles the "zoological individualism" of the species, thus putting man above the animal kingdom. Citing this view, Marx strongly disagrees with it and asks: "But does not animal worship degrade man below the animal, does it not make the animal man's god?"³

Indeed, discussing the historical stages in the development of human freedom, Engels highly valued it as man's ability to be a master of himself, his inner nature, that is, his passions, ambitions and thoughts.⁴ Fetishist conscious-

1. F. Engels, Anti-Dühring, p. 382.

2. K. Marx, F. Engels, Collected Works, Vol. 3, 1975, p.175.

3. K. Marx, F. Engels, Collected Works, Vol. 1, p. 189.

4. See F. Engels, Anti-Dühring, pp. 140-141.

means and for the fruition of the gifts of every artist with his individual creative abilities.

Religion and Its Elements

Religion is one of the more ancient forms of social consciousness. The concept

"religion" appeared in antiquity to denote man's relationship with god and with the otherworld as a whole. Religious consciousness is an illusory form of the emotional realisation by people of their relationship with nature and with one another and of their being organised into a social entity.

Religion includes three basic components: religious ideas (myths), religious feelings (emotions), and religious actions (rites).

The theoretical ("mythological") part of religion is quite important. It includes the ideas of god and other supernatural forces (the devil, angels, etc.), notions of the otherworld, and stories about the origin of the world and man's designation. Theology (from Greek theos, god, and logos, reason, law) seeks to organise these ideas into a system and to substantiate the belief in god with the help of different arguments.

The backbone of any religion and its most important and essential characteristic is the belief in the supernatural world and the forces belonging in that world. The world seems to be doubled in religious consciousness: an imaginary otherworld is built up over objective reality and man is made dependent on the forces of that world. As most theological systems explain the essence of being, they make god the supreme being which created the cosmos, earth, plants, animals and man and governs all that or at least determines the general law of being and sets ultimate objectives for man.

Religions deify and impart fantastic properties not only to the physical world, nature, but also to the world of man, to society, in which economic, political and other relations - invisible but quite real - exist. Man deified relationships established by people but independent of them, relations which got out of man's control.

As Engels put it religion is a "fantastic reflection in men's minds of those external forces which control their

religion, with all its relative independence and specific place in the field of social consciousness, is a form of reflection of the needs and interests of social classes. The religious form is a manifestation of the immaturity of the social movement: "...The religious stamp in revolutions of really universal significance is restricted to the first stages of the bourgeoisie's struggle for emancipation -- from the thirteenth to the seventeenth century..."¹

Since religious movements have always been merely an expression of deep-going social contradictions, the socio-political content of these movements often comes into contradiction with their religious form in later stages of their development. That was the case in mediaeval Europe and in Islamic countries. Today, too, we must not disregard various manifestations of religious anarchism in evaluating the revolutionary situation and clarifying the general line-up of the revolutionary and counter-revolutionary forces.

Social revolution may at first, say, at the stage of national liberation, realise itself through religious consciousness but eventually it demands that this consciousness be overcome.

Religious protest as an expression of the active or passive rejection of the existing system is important during the pre-revolutionary period as a way of the moral discrediting of dominant ideology and of shattering the old, ossified attitudes. It is necessary to take a differentiated view of the political persuasions of believers and the political positions of different religious organisations. This position can be rather progressive or rather reactionary from the political point of view. It manifests itself through the attitude of the church to present-day revolution, to the issue of war and peace, to international detente and to real socialism. In defining its position in today's world, the religious organisation (church) has to reckon both with the political sentiments of believers and their moral feelings. The main

1. K. Marx and F. Engels, Selected Works in one volume, Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1975, p. 603.

ness is characterised by acute internal contradictions: awareness of one's insignificance often goes hand-in-hand with megalomania. This consciousness is illusory and looks for the means to sustain itself in the object of worship (things, ideas, persons) rather than in the sphere of actual activity aimed at transforming the conditions of human existence.

What is the social role of religion?

Marx pointed out that religion is the opium of the people, self-deception soothing the individual living in a hostile environment and fearing for his existence. The religious consciousness of the individual, according to Marx, "complements" the world, that is, reconciles, at the level of imagination, the more acute contradictions of life. In this way religion performs a compensatory function by creating a sort of psychological barrier between man and the alien environment and by substituting make-believe, illusory solutions for the real solutions of the problems arising from man's relationship with the surrounding world.

By substituting the ideas of personal immortality and justice in the otherworld for the system of supreme human values, religion tries to distract the attention of people from the urgent problems of class struggle. In this way religion performs a regulatory and integrating function in a class society, blessing the existing system on behalf of god, on the one hand, and fostering a conformist consciousness in man, on the other. Politicians, ideologists, clergymen and other representatives of the dominant classes have been using this function of religion since its very emergence. In every period of history they used religion more or less deliberately as opium "for the people", rather than "the opium of the people."

Occasionally social protest is manifested in religious form. What can be said about the objective significance of this protest? Engels wrote that in the countries professing Christianity and Islam the mass-scale social movement used to assume a "religious coloration". This is explained by the fact that mediaeval history as a whole knew "no other form of ideology than precisely religion and theology".¹ However,

1. K. Marx and F. Engels, Selected Works in one volume, Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1975, p. 603.

democracy and social progress.

x x x

The analysis we have made above demonstrates that social consciousness is a reflection of social being and at the same time always plays a socially active role. This role consists in the effect of ideas and views, moods and emotions on the social being of people, their activity, their world outlook and their social and spiritual world as a whole.

We can define the structure of social consciousness, the basic components of that structure and the character of their interaction by tracing the links of different phenomena of social consciousness with certain social needs and specific types of social relations and activity. The historical types, levels and forms of social consciousness and their different roles in social life are determined, in the final analysis, by the division of labour in material production and by different aspects and areas of the material living conditions.

It is impossible to analyse phenomena of social consciousness without identifying their subject. The definition of the subject is important because the specific features of these spiritual phenomena and their role in society depend on their characteristics of the subject. The historical subject is usually stable groups of people which comprise the social structure of society.

cause of shifts in this area consists first and foremost in global changes taking place today at the level of social conditions as such.

If a believer today takes part in class struggle on the side of revolution, the causes of his social activity should be sought not in his religious beliefs but in the character of his faith. Present-day social practice demands from people a high level of civic consciousness so that man should be motivated to take social action not only by his desire to improve his economic situation, not only by his political views but also by the moral consciousness of the people.

Debates on the ways and character of social change and its motive forces are growing keener among the Catholics in developing countries. Different positions make themselves manifest in these debates. Only the most inveterate traditionalists deny the need for any change in the social policy of Catholicism. Considerable part of the church hierarchy in this region advocates change within the framework of moderate reformism. They believe it necessary to modernise backward socio-economic structures and to lessen dependence on imperialism. The Catholic church appeals to the ruling classes, urging them to make concessions and not to close their eyes to the long overdue social change.

However, coming against the fierce opposition of the privileged classes and trying to preserve the prestige of the Catholic church among the mass of the population, its influential leaders admit the need for reliance on the mass of the people. Some of them even justify the legitimacy of revolutionary violence.

Catholics who advocate the use of ever more radical methods of struggle pin their hopes for social progress on the anti-capitalist alternative. Marxism is exerting an ever greater influence on the left-wing religious movements.

Appraising these positive aspects of the left-wing Catholic movement, Communists believe that the dialogue and joint actions of Marxists-Leninists and Christians cannot be based on a compromise between religious ideology, on the one hand, and Marxism, on the other. However, the irreconcilable differences between these world outlooks should not hamper their unity of action in the struggle for peace,

The primary object is that of a scientific analysis of origins of social inequality by revealing the underlying basis of society's social structure. It follows from the materialist understanding of history that it is based on the mode of production of material goods and on the production relations dominant in society. Thus, practical revolutionary activities should be aimed at radically restructuring the material basis of social inequality. Yet the emergence of a new social structure does not automatically follow that of a new mode of production. Social structure is relatively stable and independent. The new social structure is likely to contain the old structural elements as well as the new ones. Still, these undergo important change as new interrelationships are being established among them.

A definite type of social structure corresponds to every historical mode of production of material goods.

The division of society into classes and class struggle were discovered and described, before Marx, by bourgeois sociologists, historians and economists.

Currently the existence of classes and class struggle is also recognised by many bourgeois ideologists. Yet what they are looking for is, as a rule, some way of eliminating class antagonisms and contradictions, while preserving the underlying system of capitalist economic and political relations. As a matter of principle, Marxists criticise these and other attempts at falsifying Marxist-Leninist theory on classes and class struggle, while exposing their true goal, that of rejecting the practical revolutionary importance of the theory for the liberation struggle of the working masses.

Marxism-Leninism sees the existence of classes and class struggle as a historical

The Origin of Classes

cal result of the development of productive forces in relation to social division of labour. Thus, primitive society, characterised by an extremely low level of productive forces development, was not divided into classes. Its basic structural elements were tribal communities, tribes, tribal alliances and, on a higher level, families. The clan and tribal social structure was distinguished by social equality

Chapter III

SOCIAL STRUCTURE

The materialist understanding of history includes a Marxist-Leninist doctrine on social structure, primarily on classes, class contradictions and class struggle. The concepts of modes of production and of socio-economic formations, the interaction of the basis and the superstructure provide the key to studying society's social system, its elements and its interaction with the economic system. Classical works of Marxism-Leninism offer a comprehensive description of the essence and origin of classes, the content and historical significance of class struggle for social progress.

1. Classes, the Basis of Social Structure

The Concept of
Social Structure

For a correct understanding
of the essence of social
structure, attention has to

be drawn to the obvious fact that society is a complicated social organism with interrelationships of its own, rather than a mechanical combination of individuals.

Society's social structure reflects its internal organisation and is based on a foundation of a purely socio-historical nature, viz., social production at same level of development.

The most important elements of social structure comprise classes and social strata, broad historical communities of people, such as one's kin, tribe, nationality, nation, personality, family, as well as urban and rural populations, workers by brain and hand.

For Communists, the question of social divisions is important primarily because it relates to a search for a revolutionary and yet genuinely scientific solution of the age-old problem of equality. Being aware of the futility and absurdity of the dream of levelling off individual abilities and talents (as was proposed by many utopian socialists), Marxists-Leninists base the idea of social equality on its sole realistic foundation, that of overcoming class inequality of men.

main tasks of a socialist revolution.

The socialist mode of production and the social ownership of means of production result in a qualitatively new social structure, characterised by the absence of class antagonisms, by cooperation and comradely mutual assistance between two friendly classes, the working class and peasantry, as well as between the two and the people's intelligentsia. Class relations also influence the nature of other elements of the social structure of socialist society, i.e., relations between nations and nationalities, rural and urban populations, workers by brain and hand and relations within the family.

Lenin's Definition of Classes

As a contribution to Marxist theory, Lenin offered a detailed definition of classes. In his article "A

Great Beginning", he wrote: "Classes are large groups of people differing from each other by the place they occupy in a historically determined system of social production, by their relation (in most cases fixed and formulated in law) to the means of production, by their role in the social organisation of labour, and, consequently, by the dimensions of the share of social wealth of which they dispose and the mode of acquiring it. Classes are groups of people one of which can appropriate the labour of another owing to the different places they occupy in a definite system of social economy."¹

The determining feature of classes is their relation to the means of production, i.e., whether a specific group owns the means of production or is deprived of them, and which form of ownership it is related to. There can be other distinctions between groups of men, e.g., whether they live in urban or rural areas, are employed in industry or trade, etc. These distinctions are secondary.

Under slave ownership, the slave owner owned not only

1. V.I. Lenin, Collected Works, Vol. 29, p. 421.

of all members and the absence of any form of exploitation or oppression. A transition from fruit-gathering to cultivating crops and from hunting to livestock breeding became an impetus for transformation of clan and tribal relations. Tribal communities were gradually replaced by neighbourhood or farming ones, where kinship no longer played the primary role, but some form of collective landownership was still preserved. This neighbourhood or farming community was to survive longer than the primitive-communal system and became a component production element of subsequent formations.

Further transformations in social structure were caused by the invention of metal (initially bronze, then iron) implements. The main element here was that man's labour was now producing more than was required to sustain the producer and his family. In other words, it was here that his output was first divided into necessary and surplus product. The possibility arose of redistributing, appropriating and accumulating the surplus product. It could then be concentrated in the hands of one part of the society, which was thus no longer required to perform manual work and began living at the expense of the other part. Exploitation of man by man originated, society was divided into hostile classes, and intellectual activity was separated from manual labour.

Marx viewed subsequent social history as a history of various methods of expropriation of the producer's surplus product, which replaced one another, as a history of successive specific historical forms by which some men coerced others to work, as a history of the existence and struggle of classes.

It is on the basis of development of social production that historical transitions from one formation to another take place, yet while exploitation of man by man exists, classes exist; these are slave-owners and slaves under the first class system, that of slave ownership; serfs and land-owners under feudalism, and the working class and the bourgeoisie in capitalist society. It is abolishing private property, making means of production public, thus eliminating the possibility of exploitation itself, followed by class antagonisms, and then by class distinctions as such, that is the

the means of production, while workers, who own none, are barred from the participation in management. It was Karl Marx who pointed out that it is not the fact that a capitalist manages industrial production that makes a capitalist a capitalist; on the contrary, he becomes a manager of industry because he is a capitalist, or a property owner.

The fact that hired managers, engineers and technicians are immediate executors of managerial functions in modern industrial production under the bourgeois system changes nothing of substance. Bourgeois ideology exaggerates the role of hired managers in its attempts to prove that a "managerial revolution", or a "revolution of technocrats", is allegedly taking place, that in the course of the current scientific and technical revolution capitalists are being replaced by a class of engineers and technicians, as a result of which capitalism allegedly ceases to be capitalism.

It is no doubt true that the number of engineers and technicians never ceases to grow under the conditions of modern production when science is becoming a productive force, and that those personally responsible for the management of modern factories, enterprises and scientific and research institutes are hired engineers and scientists, rather than capitalists themselves. This is due to the complicated nature of modern production, the management of which requires profound knowledge and specialised training. Yet directors and managers merely carry out the will of their masters, property owners. The basic role in the social organisation of labour is played by those who own the means of production. It is the upper monopoly bourgeoisie that determines the basic goals and tasks of production and channels its development. It is the big monopoly bourgeoisie, rather than engineers and technicians, that is to blame for militarisation of modern production in capitalist countries.

The mode of acquisition and share of social wealth is the next major distinguishing feature of classes. Like the others, it follows from their relation vis-a-vis the means of production. In antagonistic formations, there are two basic ways of acquiring social wealth, that of labour proper and that of exploitation. These basic ways also determine the sha-

the means of production but producers also, who were regarded as mere implements. Roman writer Varro, in a treatise on agriculture, divided implements into three categories, "... articulate, inarticulate and dumb; the articulate are slaves, the inarticulate oxen, and the dumb, carts."¹

Under feudalism, the serf peasant had some property and labour implements. Yet the landowner owned the principal means of production, i.e., land, which enabled him to appropriate surplus peasant labour, be it in the form of labour rent (métayage), rent in kind or money-rent. The law did not authorise the landowner to dispose of the peasant's life, yet personally the serf was dependent on and wholly subjugated to the landowner.

Under capitalism, all the means of production are owned by the class of the bourgeoisie. Officially, the worker is free. As opposed to the slave and the serf, he is not personally dependent on anyone. Yet he cannot exist for lack of ownership of means of production.

The next feature of class division of society is its place in the historically established system of social production. What is meant here is the role played by a specific class in society's social structure — whether it is predominant, ruling, leading or subordinate, oppressed and subjugated. This feature of classes is organically related to their position vis-à-vis the means of production. As noted, under the slave ownership system, the slave played the role of an articulate implement; under feudalism, the serf was personally dependent on and subjugated to his master, whereas under capitalism the worker is the vehicle of hired labour, one who sells his labour, abilities, knowledge, talent and work.

The role of large groups of men in the social organisation of labour is a distinguishing feature which determines which social group organises social production, determines its goals and tasks and manages production. In antagonistic formations, production is managed by owners of

1. The Ancient Mode of Production. The Sources, Leningrad, 1933, p.20 (in Russian).

societies based on slave ownership, free peasants who were petty landholders existed, as did artisans, who were neither slaves nor slave owners. They represented the incipient classes of the feudal society. As towns grew under feudalism, new social strata gained in importance; these were artisans organised in shops and corporations, traders, and others. These strata became the basis for the formation of the classes of capitalist and workers during transition to the capitalist system.

2. Class Structure of the Contemporary Capitalist Society

In the course of society's historical development, feudalism was replaced by capitalism, a socio-economic formation based on private ownership of the means of production and on exploitation of hired labour by capital.

Stages of Development
of Capitalism

The development of capitalism as a formation passes through two stages, that of pre-monopoly capitalism and that of monopoly capitalism, or imperialism. Still, the substance of its most specific elements remains the same throughout.

Its basic features are, predominance of commodity-money relations and private property, existence of developed social division of labour, increased socialisation of production, transformation of manpower into a commodity, and exploitation of hired labour by capitalists.

Antagonistic contradictions are inherent in capitalism. The basic one is that between the social nature of production and private capitalist form of appropriation of output. It generates production anarchy, unemployment, economic crises and irreconcilable conflict between the basic classes of the capitalist society, the working class and the bourgeoisie.

Significant vestiges of feudalism, especially in agriculture and small commodity production, have long existed in the capitalist society and still remain in some countries. The non-basic classes of the capitalist society are those of peasants, artisans, petty tradesmen and petty homeowners. They take up an intermediate place between the basic classes.

re of social wealth accruing to individual classes. For his forced labour, the slave received what the slave owner thought sufficient to sustain his livelihood as a slave; the serf gave away to his landowner all that the latter demanded and worked his hands to the bone to sustain himself and his family; the worker's wages depend on the price of manpower on the labour market. It is only by consistent and selfless class struggle that the workers can succeed in getting higher wages and better working conditions. The major share of material goods created by workers becomes profit for the dominant class of the bourgeoisie.

In its full dimension Lenin's definition of classes is applicable to societies split into antagonistic classes, the exploiters and the exploited. As applied to socialism, the definition loses none of its methodological importance for analysing radical changes in its social structure and the position of classes, as well as the outlook for the elimination of distinctions between the latter.

Lenin's definition of classes provides a scientific approach to analysing the class structure of society at certain stages of its development, determining the alignment of class forces, finding tendencies of change in the correlation of classes, and consequently, in the entire social structure of society.

On the basis of this definition of classes, basic, as opposed to non-basic classes, can be distinguished. In an antagonistic society, the basic classes are those brought to life by the mode of production predominant in the society. The interrelationship of the classes determines the entire nature of life in the given society, the contradictions and motive forces of its development. In the slave-owning system these are slaves and slave owners, under feudalism, serfs and landowners, and under capitalism, the working class and the bourgeoisie.

Besides the basic classes, social structure usually comprises non-basic, or transitional, classes. Their existence is due to the preservation of vestiges of the preceding modes of production or the emergence of a new mode of production in the shape of specific economic forms. For example, in

state-monopoly capitalism. Monopolies subordinate the machinery of state and all state power for the benefit of obtaining monopolistic superprofits, strengthening and broadening the financial capital, suppressing the workers' and democratic movements and the national liberation struggle of oppressed peoples, waging economic, political and ideological struggle against the world socialist system and pursuing an aggressive foreign policy.

Imperialism is not a new mode of production; rather, it is a stage in the development of capitalism. By acquiring new basic features which make it different from the pre-monopolistic stage, imperialism, while losing none of its capitalist nature, makes all the contradictions inherent in capitalism increasingly profound and acute.

The Marxist-Leninist doctrine of classes and their basic features thus remains the only scientific basis for analysing the social and class structure of the modern bourgeois society.

The Working Class

The working class is a basic element of the class structure of the industrially developed capitalist countries.

The working class of the modern capitalist society is a class of hired labourers deprived of the means of production and living on the sale of their labour, who creates the society's principal material wealth and is a subject to capitalist exploitation. The exploited working class is called the proletariat.

The main element determining the place of the proletariat in the capitalist system is its relation to the means of production. The fact that it is deprived of ownership of the means of production and is the object of capitalist exploitation, and its ensuing subordination in the production process, form the root causes of the revolutionary nature of the proletariat. At present, the proletariat accounts for the majority of the working population in modern capitalist states, with its share continuously growing.

The current revolution in science and technology is leading to a quantitative and qualitative growth of the working class, to a broadening of its ranks as a result of

In the late 19th and early 20th centuries capitalism entered the highest and final stage of its development, that of imperialism, or monopoly capitalism. Its basic distinction, principal and determining feature is dominance of major monopoly capital in economic, political and ideological fields. Lenin, in his work Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism (1917) and in some other works, offered a comprehensive analysis of the essence of imperialism.

Lenin pointed out five basic economic features of imperialism: 1) concentration of production and capital, which reached a stage of development high enough to enable it to establish monopolies, which play the decisive role in the economic life; 2) merger of banking and industrial capital and establishment, on the basis of this, of financial capital and a financial oligarchy; 3) export of capital, as opposed to export of commodities, acquires special importance; 4) international monopolistic alliances of capitalists are established to divide the world; 5) the territorial division of the globe by major capitalist powers is completed.

Imperialism pushes the contradictions of capitalism to the extreme, while increasingly reducing the number of those belonging to the upper crust of exploiters and broadening the mass of those exploited by big business. It is not only the working class that is the victim of plunder and oppression by the monopolies but also the toiling peasantry, broad groups of the intelligentsia, petty bourgeoisie and a part of the middle bourgeoisie. The oppression is strongest against the peoples of colonies and dependent countries.

Currently imperialism is no longer the predominant force in the international arena. The powerful development of the world socialist system, the national liberation movement, and the emergence of young developing countries in the international arena have, once and for all, deprived imperialism of its exclusive right to manage world affairs.

To maintain and somehow strengthen the substantially weakened foundations of imperialism, to hold its ground in competition with the increasing strength of the world socialist system, monopoly capital combines its might with that of the bourgeois state to form a single mechanism. It is for this reason that modern imperialism is also described as

International (or transnational) monopolies have become the powerful monopolistic associations. They originated already in the early 20th century as a result of the international interrelationships of capital's interests in various countries under the conditions of imperialism and on the basis of the export of capital and the economic division of the world. Their economic power nowadays is so great that they are justly described as "a state within a state" of the capitalist world, as the output of the enterprises they control, scattered over dozens of countries, surpasses the gross national product of almost any capitalist country. They currently control over half of the volume of international capitalist trade.

The supra-national monopolies have a significant influence on socio-economic policies and the position of workers in the countries which their activities embrace. A destabilising influence on the labour market, the existence of a permanent threat that production will decline, attempts to split the proletariat and weaken the organised workers' movement, and interference in the internal affairs of other countries are some of the basic consequences of expansion by supra-national monopolies. All of this causes growing concern among the broad popular masses, primarily in the countries of Western Europe, Asia, Africa and Latin America, who oppose the idea of foreign companies' running the show there and demand that a democratic control be established over their activities.

Capitalists who own the supra-national monopolies represent the top crust of the modern class of the bourgeoisie.

It is the middle bourgeoisie which remains the most mass section of the ruling class in developed capitalist countries. While it has, in common with big business, an interest in exploitation and preservation of the common conditions for domination, it nevertheless often finds itself in conflict with the monopoly bourgeoisie, which usurps part of its profits and places it in a position of economic dependence. The policy of the dominant class is dictated by the monopoly bourgeoisie, or the financial oligarchy, to which the principal

standpoint.

At present, with the increasing dominance of state-monopoly capitalism and the unfolding of the revolution in science and technology, further serious transformations are taking place in the economic and social position of the intelligentsia, which is increasingly being split into two opposing groups. On the one hand, a relatively minor part of the scientific and technical intelligentsia (about 15 to 20 per cent in developed countries) borders on the bourgeoisie. These are various managers, a system of directorships, and top administrators. Their high wages, social benefits which they enjoy, their goals, interests and their social status draw them closer to the bourgeoisie, making them take the side of the exploiters.

The other, much larger share of the scientific and technical intelligentsia comprises scientists and researchers, engineers, technicians, educational, health care workers, etc.; by their social status they are increasingly converged with the industrial and agricultural proletariat. They sell their labour (intellectual labour), are exploited, their wages differ insignificantly from those of industrial workers; it is this section of the intelligentsia that is increasingly suffering from unemployment and participates in the strike movement. The alliance of this section of the intelligentsia with the working class significantly broadens the social basis of the anti-imperialist movement while revolutionising the bourgeois society and strengthening revolutionary processes.

The Class of Capitalists

The ruling class is also undergoing structural changes. The bourgeoisie is the dominant class of the capitalist society, who owns the means of production and lives on exploiting the hired labour. The source of income of the bourgeoisie is surplus-value created by unpaid-for labour and appropriated by owners of the means of production.

The bourgeoisie is not homogeneous either. The leading section in the capitalist class is the big monopoly bourgeoisie, in the hands of whom most of society's productive forces are concentrated.

as well as India, Turkey and other countries, are at an average or close to average level of capitalist development, accompanied by the existence of quite substantial pre-capitalist vestiges. In many African and some Asian countries, pre-feudal and semi-feudal relations are predominant, while capitalist relations are underdeveloped. Finally, the socialist-oriented countries have a socio-class structure of their own. Naturally, the level of socio-economic development has a determining influence on the formation and development of the structure.

A specific feature of socio-economic development of the newly-independent countries is the persistence of a multi-structural economy, the result of predominance of colonialism, which served to preserve a number of obsolete relationships, which now prevent the development and triumph of new, more progressive relations. The existence in these countries of subsistence-patriarchal, small-commodity, feudal, small capitalist, developed capitalist, foreign capitalist, cooperative and state-capitalist economic structures is what underlies their societies' class system. In many newly-independent countries, the transformation or conservation, rather than decomposition of pre-capitalist structures, is taking place. Some economic structures, even if still maintaining the social system, nevertheless often result in a deadlock and are counterproductive. On the whole, the social structure of most newly-independent countries is characterised by the predominance of transitional forms of social relations, based on the existence of the multi-structural economy and the preservation of pre-capitalist social relations.

Complicated relations of mutual subordination and bitter struggle exist among the economic structures. The social structure of the newly-independent countries is therefore extremely complicated. It is characterised by a contradictory interaction of classes, ethnic, religious and other social groups.

One distinguishing feature of the social structure of traditional Afro-Asian society is its caste nature, which holds down the social development of newly-independent countries, as does gerontocracy (a rule by tribal chiefs). With its

levers of economic predominance belong.

An important place in the social structure of capitalist countries is taken up by the middle strata, whose position is intermediate between those of the two basic classes of the capitalist society, the workers and the bourgeoisie. These social groups are diverse and comprise both the rural and urban petty bourgeoisie and some groups of hired workers. The criterion for defining the urban petty bourgeoisie is property and the size of business, which require direct participation by the owner in the production process. In the middle strata as such, changes have been contradictory. The urban middle strata have been displaying great stability. In major industrialised capitalist countries their share is not going down, with the absolute figure in some cases even going up. The reason is, primarily, the fast growth of the sphere of services, where the share of small business is much higher than in industrial production and, secondly, a substantial increase in the so-called new middle class composed of some categories of office workers (officialdom) as well as groups of the intelligentsia forming part of the middle strata.

It can be observed that, on the whole, the middle strata in the industrially developed capitalist countries remain a mass social group, in spite of a gradual reduction of their share and strength. At the same time, structural changes in the middle strata themselves are changing their role in the system of social relations. In this connection, most obvious is the growing importance of the intelligentsia. A mass exodus of petty-bourgeois population from rural into urban areas has important political consequences.

As a result, a change is taking place in the balance of political forces to the detriment of bourgeois-centrist and conservative parties which have been parasitising on the traditional backwardness of the rural population.

3. The Socio-Class Structure of Asian, African and Latin American Countries

The newly-independent countries in Asia, Africa and Latin America are characterised by different stages of socio-economic development. A number of Latin American countries,

The vast majority of proletarians are engaged in small-scale production, characterised by a low level of division of labour, mechanisation and concentration. The percentage of unskilled, seasonal and day-labourers is very high.

As for Latin America, the working class accounts for a half of all the active population. The highest number of workers is found in Brazil, Mexico, Argentina, Venezuela and Chile. In the most developed countries of Latin America the degree of concentration of labour is high.

In Arab countries, in the early 1970s the proletariat (agricultural workers excluded) accounted for 8 to 22 per cent of the economically active population in various countries. If agricultural workers, a major share of whom are seasonal workers, are taken into account, the share of the proletariat in the total strength of the economically active population is higher. These countries are characterised by a rapid growth of the strength of the proletariat.

In African countries, the development of industry and the process of urbanisation are the factors contributing to the growing strength of the proletariat.

Although the internal structure of the proletariat in Asian, African and Latin American countries varied from country to country and from one region to another, the following basic sections can be defined: 1) hired rural workers; 2) workers in loading and unloading and auxiliary operations in industrial centres; 3) non-factory industry workers; 4) construction workers; 5) industrial, mining and railway workers.

This breakdown enables one to see a specific feature of the proletariat of these countries due to the fact that its major share is craftsmen and artisans, i.e., hired workers in small enterprises, rather than the industrial proletariat. Among the group of hired workers (agriculture excluded), the industrial proletariat is a minority. Yet this is not the most important feature of the social, economic and political position of the proletariat. It is substantially influenced by a mass exodus from agriculture with the resultant obvious and hidden unemployment, depreciation of the labour of workers, the formation of a huge army of lumpen-proletarians, the preservation of close relationships with rural areas.

strict regulation of the division of labour among various social groups, with the prohibition of marriages between members of different castes and the restriction of the choice of occupations, the caste organisation obstructs the economic development of these countries. Inherited obligatory occupations (fishing, blacksmithing, agriculture or trade) inhibit the growth and normal functioning of society's productive forces while making passivity, lack of initiative and poverty the lot of the broad mass of their population.

In many countries, the process of social stratification has not yet been completed, which influences the process of formation of some socio-historical communities, and especially the process of formation of classes. The social structure, however, is extremely dynamic. The dynamism finds its expression, in particular, in the growth of the share of the proletariat in the population of Asian, African and Latin American countries. In these, as in other countries of the world, the future belongs to the working class, as both the size and share of the working class, as well as its social role, are on the increase both in capitalist-oriented and socialist-oriented newly-independent countries.

The Working Class

The nature and specific features of the working class in the newly-independent

countries are determined by numerous factors, including socio-economic orientation (capitalist path or development towards socialism), the level of development of society's productive forces, the existence or lack of a public sector in industry and agriculture, the ratio of public and private sectors in the national economy, the nature of predominant economic branches, the content of economic relations with socialist or capitalist countries, etc. The permanent share of the working class in the newly-independent Asian and African countries (both in industry and agriculture) averages 10 to 20 per cent of the active population. Manufacturing, mostly handicrafts and domestic industries, account for an important share of the workers. Other sources of employment for workers include transportation, mining and construction Services employ a relatively high share of wage earners.

colonial domination. The quantitative growth of the proletariat has been accompanied by qualitative changes in its structure. The working class is entering the national arena and becoming an active participant of anti-imperialist struggle. This cannot but be a source of alarm for imperialist and bourgeois ideologists. Claims are made, for instance, that the nature of the "African" or the "Asian" worker makes him always and in any event a proponent of "harmony", which would unite "brothers" and "sisters", and that the class struggle advocated by Marxism is alien to the peaceful and non-violent "African", "Asian", etc., soul.

The Peasantry

The peasantry is the largest social group in the Afro-Asian countries; it is the

basic force and the most important social base of the national liberation movement. At the same time, as the experience of struggle for independence in developing countries demonstrates, the peasantry is not an independent force in this struggle, even if it does serve as a social base of the liberation movement. This is due to the specific nature of the peasantry as a class which is characterised by small property owning tendencies, a low level of political consciousness, lack of organisation and spontaneity. Another reason why the peasantry is not an independent class force is that, as a rule, it was the poorest and most oppressed section of the population in African countries, less literate and more ensnared in various prejudices than other groups.

The document adopted by the First Conference of the Communist and Workers' Parties of Tropical and Southern Africa pointed out that socio-class differentiation was becoming more profound in the continent. In a number of countries of Tropical Africa the working class had already been established, while in others it was in the process of formation. The working class has set up trade unions of its own, and in some countries even a party of its own; it is increasingly expressing the interests of the entire working people.

The peasantry, who represent the majority of the population in all African countries, is a natural and most numerous ally of the working class.

the respective ethnic group and its social institutions. In developing countries, social links and relations of pre-capitalist formations are interwoven with relations of a capitalist type. This results in the preservation of a low level of human needs, which slows down the process of upgrading the skills of workers and limits the utilisation of skilled manpower.

Still, a tendency of decomposition of the old social system has been increasingly felt over the recent years. The strength of the proletariat is rapidly growing, accompanied by an increase in its role, the formation of a class consciousness and the spread of Marxist-Leninist ideology.

The quantitative growth of the industrial proletariat is accompanied by changes in its structure and make-up. With the development of national industry, the emergence of new enterprises and whole branches based on modern technology, the share of skilled workers is growing, as is the general technological level of the working class.

The level of organisation and class consciousness is rising rapidly, as a result of which the working class more and more often acts as an independent political force, capable of leading revolutionary struggle for social restructuring.

Agricultural workers, closely linked with the semi-proletarian poor sections of the peasantry, account for about a half of the proletariat in Latin America. The agricultural workers also include unskilled full-time workers who have no property of their own, farm hands engaged in household farming, seasonal workers from among the poor peasants and the marginal urban population, and skilled workers, such as tractor drivers, engine mechanics and technicians.

In Africa, the proletariat is still not numerous and weak, although it is a rapidly developing class. The share of unskilled workers in its composition is high. The literacy level of most workers is quite low. An important share of the African proletariat is composed of seasonal workers closely linked with rural areas. Most full-time workers also have the same close links with villages.

In a number of countries of Asia and Africa, the proletariat made a significant contribution to the struggle against

framework of previous forms, in particular, within the framework of local communities, exploitation based on compensation by working off debts, etc.

The substance of rural class struggle under the circumstances lies in the struggle of all the groups of rural workers against latifundism and the monopolies.

The Bourgeoisie and Other Classes and Groups of Exploiters

In a number of newly-independent Afro-Asian countries which have chosen the path of capitalist orientation, an acceleration and broadening

of the development of national capitalism is taking place. Under direct influence of imperialist neo-colonialism and with its financial, scientific and technical assistance, capitalism of a neo-colonialist and neo-compradore type is being formed there. It is here, as well as in countries with the old traditions of capitalist business, such as, for example, India, Turkey and Egypt, that the class of the national bourgeoisie is being formed or strengthened, an important part of which is comprised by the neo-compradore bourgeoisie.

It is not in all Afro-Asian countries by far that the bourgeoisie is a serious social and political force; nevertheless, in some countries (Nigeria, Kenya, Zaire, Tunisia, Morocco, Pakistan and others) it is increasingly advancing to the forefront of political life.

In most countries of Tropical Africa there is no big business bourgeoisie based in industry. The bourgeoisie is, as a rule, represented by petty businessmen and traders. Recent years have been characterised by a growth of the bourgeoisie in some Afro-Asian countries, not only in urban, but also in rural areas, where it is taking place as a result of the stratification of peasantry, with tribe nobility, feudal and semi-feudal elements' acquiring traits of the bourgeoisie, and purchases of land by members of the urban bourgeoisie.

Over the years of independent political development, a stratum of bureaucratic or administrative bourgeoisie, represented by the officials of the top and sometimes middle levels of the state machinery, has emerged in many countries of Africa. The social status of this group and its methods of

With political independence, the role of the peasantry in the Afro-Asian countries increases substantially. Quite a significant part of the peasants have acquired a stronger political consciousness and some political experience. Especially conducive to this are the processes of social stratification of peasants with the resultant proletarisation of individual groups of the rural population taking place currently in the African countries.

In countries of Latin America, profound social differentiation of the peasantry is taking place more rapidly. Over the last decades the process has acquired a mass scale, with the transitional types combining the old (peasant) and new (proletarian or farmer) features becoming widespread.

Proletarisation of the majority of small property owners, who are forced to earn additional income by working for hire, is evident. The rural poor are characterised by the sale of their labour. Yet as the availability of manpower overtakes the demand for it almost everywhere, relative rural overpopulation is growing fast. Simultaneously, the peasant upper crust is acquiring features of the bourgeoisie. In Latin America, the nature of the process of formation of farmers as a social group is a contradictory one. With the preservation of latifundism and the old vestigial forms of exploitation, poverty and landlessness among rural workers, the land-owners resort to the most crippling and predatory forms of exploitation, money-lending, etc. This leads to the growth of contradictions between the farmers and the rural proletariat. A number of Latin American governments are pursuing a policy of using all means to strengthen the position of the farmers. Positions of the farmers are strongest in Argentina, Uruguay and southern Brazil.

The specific nature of the agrarian situation in Latin America is thus due to the fact that it is on the basis of latifundism and the preservation of the vestiges of pre-capitalist relations that capitalism is developing there. The peasantry thus suffers both as a result of the development of capitalism and as a result of its insufficient development. The process of social differentiation of the peasantry has not been completed; in many aspects, it continues within the

ments are becoming increasingly involved in the development of capitalist relations, with their position approaching that of the bourgeoisie. In countries where progressive reforms are being implemented, the feudal lords and the upper crust of the clan and tribe nobility attempted to put up a resolute resistance to revolutionary and democratic forces; in a number of countries they were subsequently forced to quit the political arena, while in others they managed to preserve their influence.

As for Latin America, the parasitising class of big landowners still exists and is playing a significant economic and political role, and possessing substantial power in a number of countries.

Over several decades, a process of gradual transformation of latifundists into the bourgeoisie has been taking place in Latin America, with the semi-feudal methods of exploitation being replaced by the bourgeois ones.

In recent years, the bourgeois governments have been using all kinds of incentives for the modernisation of latifundia "from above", while many big landowners have become more like businessmen, having adopted capitalist economic methods.

The class of the latifundists, including its most bourgeois section, is a most conservative social force. Communists see one of the basic tasks of the revolution as final elimination of latifundism through nationalisation of large land estates and their replacement by state-owned or cooperative farms.

The Middle Strata

In the complex and still not finalised socio-class structure of Afro-Asian and Latin American societies, an important role is being played by what is described by Marxist-Leninist sociology as the "middle" strata. These are a peculiar social conglomeration composed of a large part of petty property owners and producers in urban and rural areas, office workers and professionals (artists, writers, lawyers, etc.), the intelligentsia, army and police officers, students, etc.

It should be pointed out here that this social group accounts for 10 to 20 per cent of the urban population in

enrichment are attributable to such features of the bureaucratic bourgeoisie as corruption and venality, anti-popular and pro-colonial sympathies, etc.

The heterogeneity of the national bourgeoisie and the mobility of the limits of this group make its role extremely contradictory both in the struggle for national independence and at the stage of independent development of new African states. Although the majority of the national bourgeoisie has not entirely abandoned anti-imperialist and democratic positions, the local bourgeoisie, forced as it is to balance between pressure from imperialism and neo-colonialism which strive to preserve their domination in the region of the newly-independent countries, from feudal and pre-feudal elements seeking to preserve their privileges, and from the popular masses demanding radical changes in their life, and in some cases from the petty bourgeoisie and the intelligentsia with their claims to a leading role in society, often displays a tendency to compromise and conciliation and collaborate with the forces of imperialism and internal reaction.

The class of the bourgeoisie (which is gradually being joined by latifundists who turn bourgeois) enjoys the greatest economic and political influence in today's Latin America. The development of the Latin American bourgeoisie is distinguished by some major features as compared with the bourgeoisie in Western Europe. In most Latin American countries prior to World War I, the industrial bourgeoisie held an economic and political position secondary to that of the class of the big latifundists.

The Latin American bourgeoisie originated under double pressure - from foreign imperialism and from the latifundists. The fear of rupturing vital, albeit inequitable, links with foreign capital and losing its alliance with the agrarian oligarchy when faced by its class enemy, the proletariat, has never ceased to limit the scale of socio-political struggle waged by the Latin American bourgeoisie.

Feudal lords and semi-feudalists practically no longer exist as a class within the strict meaning of the term in most Afro-Asian countries. In many countries of Africa and Asia both the clan and tribe nobility and the feudal ele-

profitable form of development of their economic power. The process of class differentiation is taking place rapidly among the petty bourgeoisie. Annually thousands are drawn into the maelstrom of small business, for the most part only to become bankrupt and end up in the morass of pauperism. Only a few become small capitalists.

a few become small capitalists.

On the whole, the petty bourgeoisie characteristically adopts a vacillating and inconsistent position. Its strong desire to own property, its apolitical and conservative nature more often than not make it a mass social base for right forces in political struggle. Reformist parties in Latin America also turn to petty businessmen. At the same time, the petty bourgeoisie experiences hardships of exploitation and oppression by foreign capital, which makes them a potential ally of the working class in the struggle against despotic rule by big monopoly business and imperialism.

The Marginal Organ Strata

In the developing societies of Asian, African and Latin American countries, a major

place in social structure (due to their strength) is taken up by what is described as marginal strata. The marginal strata are those outside the process of social development, which, due to some circumstances or other, is taking place by leaps, in an unbalanced manner. The marginal strata (they are also called declassed groups) represent quite a numerous group in the population of Afro-Asian and Latin American countries. Their quantity is attributable to a low level of industrial development, overpopulation in rural areas, the impossibility of providing jobs for an important part of the population, a high level of population growth, urbanisation, lack of food, housing, and by a number of other reasons leading to the pauperisation of quite broad masses of the population. A great role here is being played by a gap between the rate of urbanisation and that of industrialisation. The urban population is growing faster than is employment outside agriculture. The possibility of finding jobs in towns for migrants from rural areas is very limited, which is the principal cause of the formation of the urban marginal strata.

Overcrowding, poverty and unemployment leave an imprint of their own on the psychology of the inhabitants of marginal

Tropical Africa, somewhat less in Asia and from 7-8 to 22-23 per cent (depending on the country) of the population in Latin American countries.

The dual nature of the strata is reflected in the fact that, on the one hand, they adjoin the working masses and are playing an active role in the liberation struggle; in many newly-independent countries of Africa they are leading the struggle. The leading role of these strata is due to the weakness of the proletariat and the bourgeoisie in former colonies and semi-colonies, as well as to the incomplete nature of socio-class differentiation in African society. In practice, the middle strata are often led by the intelligentsia (including the military) which, depending on a broad range of factors, is guided by revolutionary, democratic, and in the final analysis socialist ideals, or adopts the position of the bourgeoisie and the capitalist path of development. It is by the position of the intelligentsia that political radicalism of the middle strata is largely determined.

On the other hand, the intermediate strata also possess a number of negative qualities, such as political backwardness, various tendencies of hesitation and wavering on questions of ideology and politics, lack of political firmness and organisation, indecisiveness, etc. This makes them susceptible to manipulation by reactionary forces.

As for the social structure of Latin American countries, an important place there is taken up by urban petty bourgeoisie. The survival of the petty-bourgeois sector is due to preservation of a branch economic structure with the predominance of light industry, dependence on capitalism, a limited internal market and rapid urbanisation. This sector comprises artisans and craftsmen who use hired labour (under 5 employees), small businessmen, petty traders, and owners of small service enterprises. Small private business in Latin America is characterised by the fact that it involves an important part of factory workers and office employees. This is attributable to their dire poverty, threat of unemployment and lack of skills.

Monopolies have established an uncontested domination in small commodity production, making home industry a most

The class interest is an objective relation of a class to the existing mode of production, the social and state systems. There are fundamental (principal) and temporary (partial) class interests. A fundamental class interest consists in either strengthening the existing form of ownership and social system or advocating the destruction of the former and replacement of the latter. The fundamental class interests of the proletariat and the bourgeoisie are thus diametrically opposed and irreconcilable. As for temporary or partial class interests, these are not as important as fundamental interests are; nevertheless, they should not be ignored. They are borne of the specific conditions of life and class struggle. For example, workers of an enterprise or a group of enterprises may be waging a struggle for better working and living conditions. In the course of the struggle over specific issues, mutual concessions and individual compromises are acceptable by classes.

With classes whose objective positions within the system of social production are close, a community of basic interests may exist. For instance, the common vital interests of the working class and the peasantry create a firm basis for cooperation between them and for joint action against capital; still, specific interests and goals of each class continue to exist as their alliance develops further.

Since the fundamental interests of antagonistic classes are objectively irreconcilable, the class struggle in a society divided into opposed classes is an inevitable necessity, a law of development of antagonistic formations, rather than a temporary or accidental phenomenon.

From the time society was split into classes, continuous struggle has been taking place between the exploiters and the exploited, which is either open or hidden, armed or peaceful. It involves all spheres of social life, including economics, politics and ideology.

Slave uprisings in slave-owning societies and peasant wars throughout feudal history were part of the struggle. The wars undermined the fundamentals of the serf system and objectively resulted in the demise of the social system while clearing the way for bourgeois revolutions.

areas. They are easily influenced by demagogic and inclined to support extremist movements, both right-wing and "left"-wing. Their characteristic orientation on the strong personality makes them a social base for populist movements. The declassed and criminal elements have always been used by reactionaries in the struggle against revolutionary forces, primarily against Communists.

4. The Content and Forms of Class Struggle

When problems of dialectics were analysed, it was pointed out that the interaction and conflict of opposing forces, properties and tendencies of any process is the source of its development. The law of the unity and conflict of opposites, which reveals the source of development, and its motive forces, is reflected differently in various phenomena and processes of the objective world, including social life.

The law of the unity and conflict of opposites is effective over all social history; what changes is the specific sides of contradictions, the content of the opposing sides themselves, as well as of the properties and tendencies of social development.

Class Struggle as a Law
of Antagonistic Formations
gists who attempt to conceal its essence claim that it
results from "a mutual misunderstanding" between classes,
from unskilful policies pursued by the ruling upper crust,
from "aiding and abetting the evil elements", etc. They seek
to find social and moral values which would serve to unite
hostile classes. This, however, is not a scientific approach
to an analysis of such a complex and profound phenomenon as
class struggle.

Where is the source of class
struggle in society? What
causes it? Bourgeois ideolo-

Class struggle is borne of the material basis of social life and is generated by contradictions in the economic position of different classes in society and their conflicting interests. The most profound cause of class struggle is the existence of private ownership of the means of production.

If the content of class struggle is to be made clear, the concept of class interest has to be analysed.

socialist consciousness into the workers' movement, and to fully overcome the ideological influence of the bourgeoisie.

Political struggle by the proletariat is the highest form of class struggle, aimed, in the final analysis, at a radical transformation of the existing socio-economic system and the winning by workers of political power.

and the winning by workers of political power.

Political struggle includes effective action by the proletariat, under the leadership of a Marxist party, against bourgeois legislation, for political freedoms and for broader rights for the working class. The economic and ideological struggle can be waged on a broader scale if the workers have freedom of assembly, of association, if they have their own press and send their representatives to parliament. The political struggle comprises advanced nationwide actions by the proletariat aimed at the satisfaction of its fundamental class interests. In politics, class struggle cannot be limited to specifics; in the final analysis, its most substantial and important result is the winning of power by the working class. Lenin wrote: "Those who recognise only the class struggle are not yet Marxists; they may be found to be still within the bounds of bourgeois thinking and bourgeois politics. To confine Marxism to the theory of the class struggle means curtailing Marxism, distorting it, reducing it to something acceptable to the bourgeoisie. Only he is a Marxist who extends the recognition of the class struggle to the recognition of the dictatorship of the proletariat."¹ Political struggle by the working class, taken to the stage when it takes power, is of decisive importance in the revolutionary struggle of workers; all the other forms i.e., economic and ideological struggle, are subordinated to it.

Specific Features of Class Struggle Today

existence of a powerful socialist community or

1. V.I. Lenin, Collected Works, Vol. 25, pp. 416-417.

The elimination of feudal production relations did not abolish the private ownership of the means of production. Exploitation of man by man remained, with only its form changing. The bourgeois system came into being under attractive slogans of liberty, equality and fraternity. Yet these were only used by the bourgeoisie to push aside the feudal aristocracy and to gain power. Instead of equality, a most profound new gap of social and economic inequality appeared. Bitter class struggle, rather than fraternity, is what reigns supreme in the bourgeois society.

As opposed to preceding exploited classes, the working class is a harbinger of new, socialist production relations. Deprived of the ownership of the means of production, it has no interest in preservation of private property. It is the most advanced and resolute fighter for the elimination of exploitation and for a radical revolutionary transformation of society.

Basic Forms of Class Struggle by the Proletariat

Proletarian class struggle embraces all essential aspects of social life, viz., economic, ideological and political aspects. The basic forms of proletarian class struggle were established accordingly.

Economic struggle is historically the first and earliest form of struggle by the proletariat. Its aim is to protect the economic interests of the working class through improving working conditions, reducing working hours, increasing wages, etc. The economic struggle, however, cannot result in a radical improvement of vital conditions of the working class. In effect, it is aimed at selling manpower at a higher price.

As the class struggle developed, the working class was increasingly facing the task of bringing home to the workers the need to wage a struggle not only for temporary concessions from the ruling class, but also against the bourgeoisie as a whole and against the capitalist system. This results in the need for a higher, i.e., ideological, form of class struggle. It originated and became widespread simultaneously with the spread of Marxism.

Ideological struggle by the proletariat is a scientific, theoretical kind of struggle; it is being waged to introduce

What distinguishes the working-class movement over recent years from the previous period is a noticeable broadening of the social base of the strike movement; it now increasingly involves white-collar workers. Joint action by the working class with various sections of the bourgeois society, including the intelligentsia, office workers, students, petty businessmen, peasants and the pensioners, is gaining momentum.

The modern class struggle by the proletariat is characterised by action for interests of society as a whole, besides action for its own class interests; these include struggle against militarisation, halting wars waged by imperialist states in territories of others, protection of the environment, action against the arms race, against inflation, rising prices, suppression of national liberation movements, etc.

Such relatively new features of the class struggle as direct actions against the bourgeois state, as the demand that state policy be changed, as an attitude of mistrust towards state authority and the opposition to the subordination of the national economy to the state, are of major importance.

The influence of the working class and its Marxist-Leninist parties on international relations is steadily growing. The workers demand that detente be made more profound, international cooperation and peaceful coexistence be developed, and disputes solved peacefully.

An essential feature of proletarian class struggle is its international nature, due to the existence of a common enemy, capitalism, common vital interests, those of freedom from exploitation, and common ultimate goals, those of building a socialist society.

As a driving force behind the development of antagonistic formations, the class struggle demonstrates that the working masses are the true makers of history as it is they who promote the progress of human society.

the world socialist system, whose determining influence on the course of world development is increasing. Further, these include national liberation revolutions by peoples of former colonies, non-capitalist development of newly-independent countries, or development along the path of socialist orientation. As for the class struggle by workers of capitalist countries, it has entered a new, qualitative stage.

In the current historical period, the organic combination of struggle for democracy with that for socialism is an essential feature of the class struggle by the proletariat. The growth of monopoly capitalism into state-monopoly capitalism is accompanied by an all-out offensive by major monopolies against the interests of the working class and the broad popular masses. The petty and middle bourgeoisie also have to face increasing difficulties. The aggravation of the basic class contradiction of the bourgeois society, that between labour and capital, is thus accompanied by an intensification of the contradiction between most nations, on the one hand, and the monopolies, on the other. The new alignment of class forces creates the possibility of an alliance between the working class and the broad masses of the population in the struggle for the elimination of monopoly domination. Action for peace, detente, and radical social reforms represents general democratic tasks rallying the broadest popular masses, facilitating the struggle for socialism, for building a new society. In current circumstances, the working class is the most important and the strongest adversary of monopoly rule and the centre of gravity for all anti-monopolistic forces.

The class struggle within a national framework is closely interwoven with that in the international arena. To oppose the growing revolutionary movement, the bourgeois states form military alliances and blocs (NATO, among others), pursuing the imperialist policy in international relations, and also suppressing the revolutionary forces by means of their intervention in the event of acute crises in individual countries.

A principal feature of the workers' class struggle is its broadening in scale and an increasingly mass nature of the strike movement and longer duration of strikes.

with different socio-economic formations and in different historical situations.

At the time of national ordeals the people plays a decisive role in defending its country, in just wars and in national liberation struggles.

Heroism of millions of workers who saved Europe from enslavement by the nazis will never be forgotten. An outstanding role in this historic victory was played by the peoples of the Soviet Union, who had to shoulder most of the burden of anti-fascist struggle. The stubborn struggle waged by peoples led to the demise of the colonial system of imperialism. The heroic people of Vietnam has gained a victory over the most powerful imperialist state in the world and is now building a socialist future.

The popular masses are making an inestimable contribution to the development of mankind's cultural heritage. Having established its basis, they proceeded creating the requisites for its progress.

In the early development of culture, the working people created all cultural values. Literature and the arts have long been developed as the people's exclusive creativity. It was the people who laid the foundations for pictorial and applied arts and architecture. The popular masses have found ways of growing cereals and melting metals, invented and improved first labour implements and accumulated initial knowledge of objects and phenomena of the surrounding world.

The general tendency of the historical process consists in the constant strengthening of the role of the popular masses in history.

The working class has promoted the struggle by the popular masses to its highest historical stage. The workers' movement is overcoming isolation and estrangement, the scourge of the preceding mass movements. The broad popular masses are rallying around the proletariat; best members of the intelligentsia, who assist it in producing and acquiring a scientific revolutionary world outlook, are also taking its side. With the emergence of the working class, struggle by the popular masses reaches a level when the goal of total elimination of exploitation of man by man is set.

The Decisive Role of
Popular Masses in
History

The people is a totality of
classes and social strata who
set in motion social produc-
tion and maintain social pro-

gress. The concept of the people is a specific historical one. The classes and strata comprising the popular masses are determined by the epoch and nature of social formation.

At the time of early bourgeois revolutions, the concept "the people" comprised all social strata to the exclusion of feudal aristocracy. With the strengthening of the capitalist system the bourgeoisie became a reactionary and anti-popular force opposed to the people, i.e., the working masses. In a social liberation struggle against imperialism "the people" embraces not only working sections of the population, but also the revolutionary-minded national bourgeoisie, which joins workers and peasants in struggle against colonial domination. In the course of a popular revolution, the working class enlists the cooperation of the national bourgeoisie in carrying out democratic reforms.

The definitions of "the people" offered by many bourgeois jurists and sociologists, who use the concept to denote the totality of members of any society, are non-historical and therefore unsound. Their definitions make the concept itself void of any meaning. Just as unsound is the vulgar materialist approach to the people as only manual workers.

What determines the decisive role of the popular masses in history? Primarily, it is the fact that the people plays a determining role in production, creates labour implements, improves them, accumulates labour skills and passes them on from generation to generation; it creates material wealth for lack of which society cannot exist.

Productive activity by the masses has been and will remain a primary condition of social life. Everyday work by the popular masses does more than merely provide the society with all that it needs to exist; it creates a material basis for successive changes of socio-economic formations.

The people is playing an increasing role in social and political life. Social development is unthinkable without political activity by the masses, yet its importance varies

with different socio-economic formations and in different historical situations.

At the time of national ordeals the people plays a decisive role in defending its country, in just wars and in national liberation struggles.

Heroism of millions of workers who saved Europe from enslavement by the nazis will never be forgotten. An outstanding role in this historic victory was played by the peoples of the Soviet Union, who had to shoulder most of the burden of anti-fascist struggle. The stubborn struggle waged by peoples led to the demise of the colonial system of imperialism. The heroic people of Vietnam has gained a victory over the most powerful imperialist state in the world and is now building a socialist future.

The popular masses are making an inestimable contribution to the development of mankind's cultural heritage. Having established its basis, they proceeded creating the requisites for its progress.

In the early development of culture, the working people created all cultural values. Literature and the arts have long been developed as the people's exclusive creativity. It was the people who laid the foundations for pictorial and applied arts and architecture. The popular masses have found ways of growing cereals and melting metals, invented and improved first labour implements and accumulated initial knowledge of objects and phenomena of the surrounding world.

The general tendency of the historical process consists in the constant strengthening of the role of the popular masses in history.

The working class has promoted the struggle by the popular masses to its highest historical stage. The workers' movement is overcoming isolation and estrangement, the scourge of the preceding mass movements. The broad popular masses are rallying around the proletariat; best members of the intelligentsia, who assist it in producing and acquiring a scientific revolutionary world outlook, are also taking its side. With the emergence of the working class, struggle by the popular masses reaches a level when the goal of total elimination of exploitation of man by man is set.

The Decisive Role of
Popular Masses in
History

The people is a totality of
classes and social strata who
set in motion social produc-
tion and maintain social pro-
gress.

The concept of the people is a specific historical one. The classes and strata comprising the popular masses are determined by the epoch and nature of social formation.

At the time of early bourgeois revolutions, the concept "the people" comprised all social strata to the exclusion of feudal aristocracy. With the strengthening of the capitalist system the bourgeoisie became a reactionary and anti-popular force opposed to the people, i.e., the working masses. In a social liberation struggle against imperialism "the people" embraces not only working sections of the population, but also the revolutionary-minded national bourgeoisie, which joins workers and peasants in struggle against colonial domination. In the course of a popular revolution, the working class enlists the cooperation of the national bourgeoisie in carrying out democratic reforms.

The definitions of "the people" offered by many bourgeois jurists and sociologists, who use the concept to denote the totality of members of any society, are non-historical and therefore unsound. Their definitions make the concept itself void of any meaning. Just as unsound is the vulgar materialist approach to the people as only manual workers.

What determines the decisive role of the popular masses in history? Primarily, it is the fact that the people plays a determining rôle in production, creates labour implements, improves them, accumulates labour skills and passes them on from generation to generation; it creates material wealth for lack of which society cannot exist.

Productive activity by the masses has been and will remain a primary condition of social life. Everyday work by the popular masses does more than merely provide the society with all that it needs to exist; it creates a material basis for successive changes of socio-economic formations.

The people is playing an increasing rôle in social and political life. Social development is unthinkable without political activity by the masses, yet its importance varies

class. This stage embraces the period from 1917 through the late 1930s, or about 20 years of development along the socialist path. Over this historically brief period, following the difficult years of foreign armed intervention and economic dislocation, four economic structures (capitalist, state-capitalist, small commodity and patriarchal) which existed in addition to the socialist structure, were replaced by a single socialist structure. Accordingly, a new social structure, the one composed exclusively of socialist groups of working people, made its appearance.

The exploiting classes were eliminated, as was the social antithesis between town and country, between mental and physical labour. The class of small commodity, petty-bourgeois peasantry and artisans was transformed into a socialist class, that of collective farmers and cooperative artisans. A qualitatively new social structure was established, composed of the working class, collective-farm peasantry and a section of the intelligentsia and office workers.

The second stage is that of transformation of the new social structure as a result of the development based on its own, socialist foundation, into essentially a mature and developed one. This stage embraces the period from the late 1930s to the late 1960s, i.e., about 30 years; this period saw the Great Patriotic War of 1941-1945, and the rehabilitation of the war-ravaged economy.

The third stage, the stage of advanced socialism as the result of development of the country along the path opened up by the Great October Socialist Revolution, finds its expression in an increased level of maturity of the social structure as a whole and of its constituent classes and social groups, in a consistent overcoming of social and class differences and in the increasing social homogeneity of Soviet society.

The advanced socialist society in the USSR is characterised by profound socio-economic transformations. Exploitation of man by man, class antagonisms and national strife have been done away with once and for all. The alliance of the working class, collective-farm peasantry and the people's

The Social Structure of the USSR: a General Description

19-155

449

5. Social Structure of Socialist Society

The Current Epoch
and Socialism

trends reflected the interests of various forces opposing capitalism and all the diversity of socialist theoretical thinking.

Currently, the trends which describe themselves as socialist embrace dozens of most diverse movements.

Even a brief enumeration of social movements and political forces which proclaim socialist slogans reflects the indisputable fact that this epoch is one of transition to socialism. While in the 19th century only a few parties and political trends, even those in some countries of Europe and the USA, rallied under the banner of socialism; while in the first quarter of this century socialism was being built in just one country and relatively few communist and workers' parties rallied under its banner, the modern socialist movement is a broad current increasingly involving new countries and social forces. That this is a result of great achievements by the world communist movement and its increased direct and indirect influence on the entire course of social development in the 20th century is irrefutable.

When one talks about modern socialism, he should make a distinction, first, between socialism as a real experience, or in other words, the experience of the practical building of a new, socialist society; second, socialism as a socio-political movement; and third, socialism as an ideology.

In a brief historical period, socialism has demonstrated its irresistible vitality and ability to become deeply rooted and develop under most diverse conditions.

Since the triumphant October Revolution of 1917, the social structure of the USSR has passed through three basic stages of radical transformation and development.

The first stage is that of a revolutionary transformation of social structure from the non-socialist into a socialist one, or into a structure composed only of working classes and social groups with the leading role of the working

agriculture. This accounts for the existence of the cooperative and collective-farm property. Collective-farm land is state property only in the long term, being as it is assigned to collective farms for free and perpetual use. Collective farms own agricultural machinery and other means of production. Yet it is not individuals or groups of individuals who own the means of production in a collective farm; these are social property, and this totally precludes any exploitation of man by man.

The two forms of socialist social ownership also determine the existence of two major social classes under socialism, the working class and the collective-farm peasantry. Yet there are no relations of domination and subordination or competition between them; on the contrary, relations which exist are those of friendship and mutual assistance.

The working class of advanced socialist society is a class of workers engaged in public socialist enterprises which plays a leading role in society.

The basic class-forming feature of the working class is, primarily, its relation to state (public) ownership of the means of production. In the system of social production, the working class plays the leading role vis-à-vis all the other social groups. A reflection of this is that its labour creates most of the material wealth of society, that it has to deal with the most advanced equipment and technology, is characterised by strict discipline, developed political consciousness, is advanced ideologically and most consistent. At present, there are about 80 million workers in the USSR, who make up two thirds of the active population. This signifies, as the 26th Congress of the CPSU pointed out, that "the working class is not only the largest class numerically but constitutes the majority of the working people."¹ The working

1. Documents and Resolutions. The 26th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, Novosti Press Agency Publishing House, Moscow, 1981, p. 67.

intelligentsia, the friendship between nations and nationalities has been strengthened. Socio-political and ideological unity has been achieved in Soviet society, with the working class as its motive force. Under advanced socialism a new, heretofore unknown social and class structure was established, to which evaluations and definitions, traditional under preceding social formations, are not applicable and which requires creative comprehension from a position of Marxist-Leninist methodology.

The basis of the economic and social system under advanced socialism is socialist ownership of the means of production in the form of state (public) and cooperative and collective-farm property. All the means of production belong to the entire people; there is no class or social stratum which would be able to use the means of production in its own selfish interests.

Under advanced socialism, the land, its mineral resources, waters and forests are the exclusive property of the state. The state owns the basic means of production in industry, construction and agriculture, as well as transport, communications, the banks, the property of state-established trade, community service and other facilities, the bulk of urban housing, as well as other property required for the accomplishment of state tasks. The source of growth of social wealth, as well as of improved well-being of the people as a whole and of every Soviet individual, is labour of men working for themselves and free of exploitation. In accordance with the principle of "From each according to his ability, to each according to his work", the state controls the amount of work and the amount of consumption. The supreme goal of production under socialism is the fullest satisfaction of men's growing material and spiritual requirements.

The existence of two forms of socialist social property, the state one and the cooperative and collective-farm one, is due to the historically different levels of development of productive forces in industry and agriculture. A relatively lower level of the productive forces of agricultural labour, as well as social and psychological traditions preclude a simultaneous introduction of state ownership in all areas of

the development of social production by developing science, engineering and latest technology, training skilled workers for all branches of the economy and maintaining the spiritual development of all members of the society.

Within the social structure of advanced socialist society, a place of importance belongs to office workers, a social stratum of those employed in social production management. Their basic social role is to establish the most favourable conditions for the work of the working class, collective farmers and the intelligentsia.

Besides the productive social groups, the social structure of the Soviet society also comprises groups of a non-productive nature. The first category comprises the active population, i.e., the working class, collective farmers, the intelligentsia and office workers, while the second embraces the population which is not directly involved in the economy, such as students, housewives and the pensioners. They are all characterised by a high level of social activity, which is due to their common basic interests, convictions and goals.

Towards a Classless Society

The principal trend of development of the social structure of the Soviet

society under advanced socialism is the continuous rapprochement of the labouring classes and strata and the growth of social homogeneity. The documents of the CPSU stated: "Our aim is to create a society in which people will not be divided into classes. And it may be said quite definitely that we are gradually and surely advancing towards that great objective."¹

The division of society into classes is a transient period in the history of mankind, due exclusively to the dominance of private ownership of the means of production. The establishment of social ownership as a result of the socialist revolution and the building of socialism serve to eliminate the antagonistic classes and subsequently the classes

1. Documents and Resolutions, The 26th Congress, p. 67.

class is playing the leading role in the organisation of all social production, the determining role in the implementation of national economic development plans. As distinct from the collective-farm peasantry which, besides monetary income, also receives remuneration in kind, the working class is related exclusively to the monetary form of remuneration in accordance with the quantity and quality of its work.

The social activity and political maturity of the working class are continuously on the rise. The educational and vocational training level of workers is going up continuously. Under advanced socialism and due to the impact of the scientific and technical revolution, a more harmonious relationship is being established between physical and mental labour.

The peasantry of the advanced socialist society is a principal social class which has collective socialist ownership of large-scale and highly mechanised agriculture based on collectivist principles.

The collective-farm system of production has played a tremendous role in the life of the peasantry and the entire people. It has strengthened the alliance of the working class and the peasantry and became a solid basis for the participation of peasants in managing social affairs and solving problems of nationwide importance; it has used the benefits of large-scale agricultural production for the purposes of socialism while developing production on a modern industrial basis. The new economic system offers the peasantry unlimited opportunities for cultural and scientific development as well as mastering Marxism-Leninism, the ideology of the working class, and acquiring a collectivist psychology.

The intelligentsia of the advanced socialist society is a social stratum distinguished from the working class and the collective-farm peasantry according to the following features: its place in the social division of labour, as its occupations have to do with difficult intellectual work; its role in the social organisation of labour, as it has specific functions of management in industry and other spheres of social life; it also has a higher cultural and technical level. The basic social role of the intelligentsia consists in influencing

type, whose origin, functioning and interaction are based on their fundamental interests and social goals and whose development is taking place towards a gradual obliteration of economic, social, cultural, psychological and other differences between them. The social homogeneity of society will be further promoted as the communist formation makes progress. The highest stage of communism will be characterised by the social homogeneity of society and the absence of any classes or class distinctions. Society of developed socialism is a natural and necessary stage in this development, the stage that the Soviet Union finds itself in at present and that is successfully unfolding in the socialist countries.

6. Nationality Relations

Nature of Nationality
Relations

In considering nationality relations, Marxism-Leninism, without ignoring biological

differences between people, e.g., differences between races, lays emphasis on the social aspects of these relations. It is the purposeful activity of man as a social being, transforming the surrounding world to meet his material and spiritual needs, that provides the key to an understanding of differences between nationalities and of the formation of different human communities.

Engels believed that labour is the "prime basic condition for all human existence, and this to such an extent that, in a sense, we have to say that labour created man himself."¹ His work The Part Played by Labour in the Transition from Ape to Man shows that labour is understood as a broad concept including the totality of social actions taken by way of adaptation to the environment. At the early stages of human development those actions included gathering and use of wild fruit, vegetables, etc. as food. At subsequent stages gathering was complemented by hunting and fishing, which required certain implements, such as harpoons and stone axes. As hunting and gathering developed and grew more complex, they

1. F. Engels, Dialectics of Nature, Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1974, p. 170.

in general. Achieving social homogeneity is a long historical process involving substantial changes in all social relations, primarily those in the material basis, in the sphere of production relations.

As Soviet experience demonstrates, this stage of advanced socialism is characterised by a continuous rise in the level of socialisation of the economy and a steady rapprochement of the state (public) and collective-farm and cooperative forms of socialist ownership. Contributing to this is the process of further specialisation and concentration of agricultural production on the basis of inter-farm cooperation and agro-industrial integration.

The convergence of the working class and the intelligentsia, and of the peasantry and the intelligentsia takes place on the basis of a wide use of the latest achievements of the revolution in science and technology in all the spheres of social production, by means of a gradual obliteration of differences between mental and physical labour, of the further development of general and specialised education, ideological and political education and preparation of every worker for creative work.

Established on an increasing scale are creative work teams comprising scientists, engineers and skilled workers with the purpose of joint development of production projects, such as designing new machines and developing new technological processes, equipment, rational utilisation of farmlands, drafting architectural layouts of villages, rational use of natural resources, etc.

The obliteration of differences between workers and peasants on the one hand, and the intelligentsia, on the other, also results from the fact that creative activities are playing an increasing role in the life and work of working people, with the number of workers making proposals to improve old production processes and of inventors growing steadily, with large-scale development of on-the-job training by experienced workers who share their experience with young, with the development of folk art, etc.

The social structure of the socialist society is therefore a dynamic and continuously developing totality of classes, social strata and groups, communities of a socialist

were noticed from time immemorial. Meeting a representative of a different culture, which was more or less strange, man immediately took note of the "alienness" of the other. First and foremost, they could not communicate because they spoke different languages.

If man got a more intimate knowledge of another human group than his own, he realised that the customs, beliefs, methods of land cultivation, etc., in that group were different from his own, were "strange".

Many centuries passed before people formulated that problem in more theoretical terms: what were basic differences between human groups? The answer to this question was supplied by ethnography, a science studying the cultures of different human groups at different stages of their development. Marxist-Leninist ethnography has evolved the concept of ethnos, which makes it possible to draw general conclusions from the specific and inimitable characteristics of the cultures of different human groups. Ethnos, or the ethnic group, is a human group having a specific culture in the broad sense of the word. Ethnic groups are characterised by such stable, distinctive and outwardly manifest components of culture as the language, customs, rites, rules of conduct, folk pictorial art, oral artistic tradition and religious beliefs. One characteristic and essential feature of ethnic groups is their being distinctive from one another. This distinctness, naturally, presupposes awareness of their being different from other ethnic groups (ethnic self-awareness), which is manifest, in particular, in the self-given names (ethonyms) of ethnic groups.

In this interpretation ethnos denotes certain cultural aspects of such human groups as the people, the tribe, the nationality, and the nation, and is largely equivalent to these concepts while having a broader meaning. It is thus possible to identify different ethnoses, such as the French, Arabic, Chinese, Russian, etc.

However, it would have been quite insufficient and methodologically wrong from the point of view of historical materialism to limit ourselves to this characteristic of the peoples and nations. Obviously, the ethnic group of the

eventually led to the emergence of cattle-breeding and crop farming, after which crafts gradually came into being.

The accumulation of social experience resulted in the gradual development of the productive forces, which liberated man to an ever greater degree from the unconditional sway of nature. Man was developing culture as the antithesis of nature.

There are different definitions of culture and many questions related to culture are considered in this textbook. What is of interest of us in this case is that culture and nature being opposites, coexist in a dialectical unity. An artifact, for instance, is what cannot be found in nature. But at the same time its material basis can only be found in the environment. For instance, the spear with the fire-hardened point is an artifact characterising primitive society at that spear, however, was undoubtedly a straight branch of a tree growing in the area where primitive hunters lived.

We have thus approached a major question, namely, the dependence of the characteristics of human culture at the early stages of its development on the environment. Obviously, irrigation farming could have emerged and did emerge in the alluvial plains of major rivers in the Old and the New World. It could not have appeared in arid zones, where mobile forms of economic activity, such as nomadic cattle-breeding and hunting either on foot or with the use of riding animals, were practised. At the same time there existed countless minor differences even under conditions of the same type of economy, such as different crops, domesticated animals, materials used to build dwellings and implements, etc. For this reason there were found different characteristics of material culture, such as methods of land cultivation and tools used for this purpose, among various human groups. Naturally, components of spiritual culture -- myths, legends, customs, etc., -- differed as well. In this way diverse cultural complexes of different human groups have evolved.

Concept of Ethnic Community

Differences between cultures of human groups, both those living nearby and those separated by vast distances,

characterised by a more or less equal distribution of the necessities of life. Primitive production, the absence of surplus product, etc., all resulted in the relative self-isolation of the tribe and made its economic activity "natural". There were elements of social government in developed primitive society, such as the council of elders. According to Engels, the tribe is characterised by a certain commonality of its dialect (language), common religious beliefs (mythology), rites and distinctive name.¹ Tribal self-awareness was manifest in the belief that members of the tribe were blood relatives.

As society became divided into classes, a new type of ethno-social group, the nationality, emerged in pre-capitalist exploiting (slave-owning and feudal) formations. Ethno-social processes in pre-capitalist formations divided into classes were very complex. As the total strength of the population grew in a certain region, tribal ethno-social groups merged into larger groups, nationalities. Engels wrote: "The increased density of the population necessitated closer union internally and externally. Everywhere the federation of kindred tribes became a necessity, and soon after, their amalgamation..."² Mass-scale migrations, in which some ethno-social groups were conquered by others and subsequently merged with them to one extent or another, also influenced the process of the formation of nationalities. Early class states, which often emerged on the basis of groups of related tribes, were an important factor in the establishment of nationalities as well.³ However, it was the development of the productive forces and the appearance of surplus product that played the decisive role in the emergence of nationalities as larger communities with more complex organisation in comparison with tribes. The appearance of surplus product, as well as the division of labour and the emergence of classes, were respon-

1. See F. Engels, The Origin of the Family, Private Property and the State, Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1972, pp.90-94, 103-105, 124-126, 140-148.

2. Ibid., p. 160.

3. See Marx/Engels, Werke, Dietz Verlag, Berlin, 1962, p.396.

French under feudalism was different from what it is today. The Arabs of the 6th century, for instance, differ from the present-day Arabs, etc. The very culture of ethnic groups, including all the components mentioned above -- i.e., the basis which makes them distinctively different -- are subject to change. How, why, and in what way does this change occur? In answering these questions, we should bear in mind that every ethnic group can emerge and exist only through meeting its material and spiritual needs, for which purpose it alters and transforms the surrounding world. In the course of this process definite social (economic) relations evolve within the ethnic group. For this reason it is always an ethno-social group, i.e., a group characterised by an historically definite type of culture and economic structure, as a result of which social (economic) relations depending on the development level of the productive forces take shape within the ethno-social group. In this way every ethnic group as it develops can be viewed as an historical succession of ethno-social groups linked by continuity.

It is socio-economic formations that provide the basis for classifying ethno-social groups. The basic types of the latter are ethno-social groups with primitive-communal, slave-owning, feudal, capitalist and socialist relations. That is why we discuss in terms of historical materialism the Arabs of the period of the decline of primitive-communal relations (roughly the 6th century A.D.), the Arabs of the period of feudalism, the Arabs of the period of colonial dependence and the present-day Arabs, meaning successive ethno-social groups in different periods of history or, which is the same, an ethno-social group in its historical development.

Let us characterise different historical types of ethno-social groups, bearing in mind that, first, we will concentrate on the commonality of cultural and economic indicators and that, second, the economic factors, when all is said and done, play the decisive role in the establishment of historical types of ethno-social communities.

The basic ethno-social group under the primitive-communal system was the tribe. Its economic basis was the communal ownership of the primitive means of production and it was

large geographic areas were populated by nationalities speaking close or similar languages (dialects). That expansion had been unnecessary and even impossible under conditions of feudal production and exchange. As for capitalism, it destroyed mediaeval, communal, guild and other similar relations, gradually replacing them with relations of the capitalist market.

In this way a nation was developing in a certain area, the size of which was ultimately determined by the needs of the expanded capitalist market; it was characterised by a common language, by relatively common socio-psychological characteristics ("psychological make-up") and, what is most important, by integrated economic activity.

It should be explained here that by the commonality of language historical materialism means not a single and only language being spoken by representatives of one capitalist nation or another but the existence of a language of communication and mutual understanding (as a rule, the official language), which is spoken virtually by all the people living in the territory of a nation-state. This does not rule out the existence of several dialects of the same language (e.g., in France or Spain) or even several languages (e.g., in Switzerland). Furthermore, there can be in the territory of a nation-state "enclaves" inhabited by those ethno-social groups which by virtue of certain historical circumstances have not been entirely assimilated into a capitalist nation. More often than not, they are those territories and ethnic groups which have been included in a nation-state comparatively late or those which live in relative economic isolation (for instance, in the mountains). Under these conditions a capitalist nation may include "islets" of surviving or rudimentary ethno-social groups.

At the same time it would be erroneous to view a capitalist nation as something homogeneous, consisting of identical and unified components. The capitalist nation is intrinsically "torn apart", disunited, and this disunity makes itself felt first and foremost in the existence of antagonistic classes. This fact was noted by Lenin in a seemingly

sible for the fact that relations of barter and trade between different ethno-social groups were becoming more regular and extensive, on the one hand, and that hostility, provoked by a desire to seize the materialised surplus product, trade routes, labour (slaves), etc., could and sometimes did flare up between them, on the other.

The nationality of the slave-owning period is characterised by a common language, a dominant culture, and the establishment of political contacts instead of marital and blood relations between members of that ethno-social community. This ethno-social group is intrinsically heterogeneous, which is manifest in the fact that other ethno-social groups or their representatives (e.g., ethnically different slaves) exist within it without being wholly assimilated. But the main factor is that this group consists of representatives of different, antagonistic classes. The nationality of the slave-owning period, however, also was characterised by instability, by a tendency for disintegration, with another nationality being formed from its "fragments".

The nationality of the period of feudalism, though retaining the characteristics described above, was more stable. That stability was ensured, in particular, by the appearance in several parts of the world of centralised states with more or less uniform legislation and with one language being used for communication of every type within such a state. The main role here was played by the formation of far stabler economic complexes with the social division of labour within them (town -- countryside, crafts -- farming, etc.).

It was at that time, however, that capitalist nations began to emerge. The formation of capitalist nations was not a simple process of the numerical growth of a nationality which, historically, was the forerunner of the nation in question. Nationality relationships cannot be viewed as the immediate extension and generalisation of preceding relationships.

The capitalist nation developed on the basis of the existing communities as a consequence of the expansion of the market. That expansion was called for by the very nature of production and exchange under capitalism, when comparatively

political, cultural and religious inequality. If a certain people has not reached a definite level of the development of the productive forces and, accordingly, a definite high level of political awareness, this national-class oppression can be interpreted only as ethnic, religious, cultural, etc.

This situation gives rise to class-ethnic (class-national) liberation movements alongside class liberation movements: from rebellion of slaves in Ancient Rome to national liberation movements in Asia, Africa and Latin America and separatist movements in Europe.

There are a number of problems which are referred to as the nationality question, i.e., the combination of class and ethnic (national) oppression in different forms, and, accordingly, a struggle against that oppression.

Nations and nation-states were formed during the rise of capitalism. At that time the nationality question predominantly confined to the boundaries of one state. National movements were anti-feudal from the point of view of their character and role and constituted a condition for the establishment of capitalism.

During the early period of imperialism the world was carved out between well-established bourgeois nations and colonial oppression set in. The bourgeoisie of the dominant nation oppressed the peoples of the colonies and dependent countries, while the latter rose in struggle for their independence. The nationality question here expressed the conflict between the revolutionary, liberatory and democratic movement of the working class, the peasantry, the working intelligentsia, a part of the national bourgeoisie and other progressive forces, on the one hand, and the imperialist bourgeoisie, on the other. The process of national consolidation in Asian, African and Latin American countries began in the course of powerful anti-imperialist movements.

The present epoch, the epoch of transition from capitalism to socialism, is also a period of the disintegration of the colonial system and the national consolidation of the peoples which have won political independence. This process is no longer being influenced to a vast extent by the national-colonial question; it is now being influenced by the

paradoxical form: "There are two nations in every modern nation..."¹

Ethno-Social
Contradictions

Any historical type of an ethno-social group in exploiting society (the tribe in the disintegrated primitive-

communal system, the slave-owning nationality, the feudal nationality or the capitalist nation) is a dialectical unity of antagonistic classes set in opposition to each other, e.g., the slaves and the slave-owners, the feudal lords and the serfs, the capitalists and the proletarians. In addition, class antagonisms are overlaid by antagonisms of a different kind, ethno-social or ethno-class, appearing in the course and as a result of the economic expansion of ethno-social groups. This point is graphically exemplified by the slave-owning system, in which divisions along class lines largely coincided with divisions along ethnic lines. For instance, slaves and slave-owners, representing different classes, as a rule, belonged to different ethnic groups.

The onset of feudalism was marked by a large number of wars between different small and large state-political formations and different ethno-social groups. Those conflicts had primarily economic reasons, such as a desire to seize fertile lands and trade routes, to levy taxes on some area, etc. Their driving forces were the economic interests of the dominant, exploiting classes.

As a consequence, class oppression and inequality were compounded by ethnic oppression and inequality, or, in other words, divisions of society along class lines and its ethnic divisions criss-crossed in one form or another, or the class divisions of two socio-ethnic organisms intermingled. History abounds in instances of such criss-crossing or intermingling: for instance, the Ottoman Empire and the British Empire. We come here across the phenomenon of national-class oppression and inequality. This oppression and inequality is primarily economical, but it also can take different forms, e.g.,

1. V.I. Lenin, Collected Works, Vol. 20, p. 32.

and its party that are holding the most consistent and firm positions on the nationality question. The nationality question can only be resolved in full if class antagonisms -- both in the oppressing and the oppressed socio-ethnic groups and also in relations between them -- are resolved. This solution to the nationality question is only made possible by socialist revolution, which establishes genuine equality between all members of society regardless of their national (ethnic) origin.

National Contradictions in Developed Capitalist Countries

It is a graphic illustration of the unresolved nationality question under conditions of capitalism that during the second half of the 20th cen-

tury Europe was (and remains to a large extent) a scene of nationalistic or regional separatist movements. This fact may seem strange because the European capitalist nations are considered well established. But the actual situation is somewhat different. In France, for instance, there are separatist tendencies in Brittany, Alsace and on Corsica.

Brittany has always been the most backward area of France. This backwardness grew even worse at the end of the 19th century, when industry and modern agriculture were making particularly rapid progress in other parts of the country. Economic backwardness was compounded by the centralised administration's neglect for the original culture and language of the local population, most of whom speak one of the Celtic dialects. There are organisations in Brittany which are pressing for extensive autonomy, while extremists want independence for that part of France.

Alsace is another region of France with marked separatist tendencies. The National Dignity Movement there advocates regional autonomy and equality of languages (the teaching of a German dialect in schools). There also is an extremist Pan-Germanic movement.

Similar processes are taking place on Corsica.

Other European capitalist countries are not free from conflicts on national grounds either. There are separatist movements on the Basques in Spain and France, the Celts in

and its party that are holding the most consistent and firm positions on the nationality question. The nationality question can only be resolved in full if class antagonisms -- both in the oppressing and the oppressed socio-ethnic groups and also in relations between them -- are resolved. This solution to the nationality question is only made possible by socialist revolution, which establishes genuine equality between all members of society regardless of their national (ethnic) origin.

National Contradictions in Developed Capitalist Countries

It is a graphic illustration of the unresolved nationality question under conditions of capitalism that during the second half of the 20th cen-

tury Europe was (and remains to a large extent) a scene of nationalistic or regional separatist movements. This fact may seem strange because the European capitalist nations are considered well established. But the actual situation is somewhat different. In France, for instance, there are separatist tendencies in Brittany, Alsace and on Corsica.

Brittany has always been the most backward area of France. This backwardness grew even worse at the end of the 19th century, when industry and modern agriculture were making particularly rapid progress in other parts of the country. Economic backwardness was compounded by the centralised administration's neglect for the original culture and language of the local population, most of whom speak one of the Celtic dialects. There are organisations in Brittany which are pressing for extensive autonomy, while extremists want independence for that part of France.

Alsace is another region of France with marked separatist tendencies. The National Dignity Movement there advocates regional autonomy and equality of languages (the teaching of a German dialect in schools). There also is an extremist Pan-Germanic movement.

Similar processes are taking place on Corsica.

Other European capitalist countries are not free from conflicts on national grounds either. There are separatist movements on the Basques in Spain and France, the Celts in

domestic question of the self-determination of independent states which are governed by the national-democratic and other progressive forces.

At the same time nationality relations are characterised by a number of new features at the present stage.

First and foremost, the imperialist bourgeoisie uses different forms of neo-colonialism instead of overt colonial oppression. Monopoly capital, employing the mechanism of transnational monopolies and corporations, in stepping up the exploitation of both the developing countries involved in the world capitalist economy and those countries which have reached the medium level of development. The scientific and technological revolution is exerting a contradictory effect on the character of nationality relations. It is provoking strong integration processes in the economy, technology, science and culture, involving whole nations and peoples in the economic and political affairs of world capitalism. However, as a result of the antagonistic nature of capitalism and the selfish interests of monopolies, this "involvement" is coercive, provoking in the peoples a desire for independence and struggle against any national oppression.

The nationality question is very acute in the countries of the non-socialist world. The national, race, cultural, linguistic or religious differences and frictions in them are intertwined, as a rule, with serious social and class problems affecting the vital interests of individual ethnic groups and peoples.

Every class participating in the national movement pursues its own class interests. The national bourgeoisie, by virtue of its ambiguous nature, is progressive precisely to the extent to which it is interested in the accomplishment of the basic tasks of the anti-imperialist and anti-feudal revolution. However, as these tasks are accomplished, the national bourgeoisie loses its revolutionary potential and seeks compromise with the imperialist bourgeoisie and domestic reaction. The objective interests of the working class and the peasantry and all the other working people allied with them demand the complete eradication of every form of oppression, including national oppression. It is the working class

consciousness, etc. One more factor is the development of national unity or consolidation of it, because economic growth calls for the integrated community of a nation-state. However, economic activity should be integrated as well for the social community to emerge. We face a sort of vicious circle here.

This situation is a consequence of the sustained colonial rule of the imperialist powers, which kept many liberated countries in economic backwardness. At the same time colonial territories either bringing together representatives of different ethnic groups or even races, or dividing representatives of ethnic communities by borders of different colonial possessions, appeared as a result of the classical colonialist policy of "divide and rule" and successive conquests, divisions and redivisions of the world. Both economic backwardness and those borders were subsequently inherited by newly-free countries.

The disintegration of the colonial system of imperialism and the formation of sovereign states have given rise to the political self-awareness of the liberated peoples and at the same time contributed to their ethnic consolidation. However, this process is rather contradictory and has run into numerous difficulties, particularly in Tropical Africa. It is being held back first and foremost by the motley legacy of colonialism, which in its day made every effort to sow discord among ethnic groups on the continent.

Carving and recarving the map of Africa, marking "French" and "Belgian" Congo, "British" and "French" Togo, etc., and following its "divide and rule" principle, imperialism was cutting "on the raw", concerning itself least of all with the preservation of the integrity of ethnic groups. As a consequence, historical ethnic contacts were disrupted and ethnic borders redrawn. Many nationalities became artificially disunited, "cut apart" by state borders, established by the imperialists for their own convenience, as a rule, along parallels or meridians.

The nationalities speaking the same language or its dialects and historically inter-related have found themselves upon liberation in different states with different social systems, socio-economic and foreign-policy orientati-

Britain, conflicts between the Flemings and the Walloons in Belgium, etc. Northern Ireland represents a most graphic example of an ethnic (ethno-religious) conflict. In the Americas, for instance, in the USA, we find a similar problem, aggravated by racial differences.

Conflicts on ethnic (national) grounds in developed capitalist countries have different causes. As a rule, to understand them properly it is necessary to make an historical analysis, complemented by an analysis of the present-day socio-economic situation in a given country. In many cases we come across common factors of such conflicts, such as the economic backwardness of individual areas, the uneven distribution of the national product between regions, overt or covert discrimination in employment and pay (on religious, language, race or some other grounds), and discrimination in education and culture. Examining such conflicts, we should also bear in mind that in many cases they are artificially fomented by certain groups of the bourgeoisie. This practice is exemplified by attempts to blame immigrant workers for unemployment and declining real wages in developed capitalist countries. That is why, here as in other cases, the approach to conflicts on ethnic (national) grounds should be a class approach, based on proletarian internationalism.

Nationality Problems in
Countries of Africa, Asia
and Latin America

At present independent countries in Asia and Africa are facing a range of problems related to their socio-economic progress and the deve-

lopment of their national statehood. Of course, each of those countries is tackling its own specific problems, but some aspects that are common to all of them can be identified. The first of them is the choice of a road of development, or social orientation. The practice of the past few decades shows that the choice of the road of development is not an instantaneous act but a long, arduous and contradictory process depending on many internal and external political factors, the degree of class differentiation and polarisation, the existence of the working class and its advanced detachment, communist and workers' parties, and the level of their

to eradicate tribalism¹ and parochialism, to resolve correctly the nationality question under conditions of countries inhabited by a multitude of nationalities and tribes, speaking many languages and dialects only through deep-going democratic and anti-imperialist reforms, bringing to its conclusion the struggle against neo-colonialism and imperialism.

Relations between nationalities and the nationality question in Arab countries also exemplify the complexity of this problem from the point of view of theory and its acuteness in practice.

Countries inhabited by the Arabs, representing quite a few socio-ethnic groups, spread over a vast area from the Persian Gulf to the Atlantic. They are united to a certain extent by their common language with dialects and by many common cultural features. These countries are characterised by different economic structures, not only in the Arab region as a whole but also in every individual country. There are countries in which capitalist relations have made considerable progress and countries which have set out to build socialism, feudal and even primitive-communal relations have not yet been overcome in many of them. In this sense much importance is attached, for instance, to the tribal problem, found, although to different extents, virtually in all the Arab countries. The tribal problem is a totality of political, economic, socio-psychological, cultural, domestic, ideological and other problems determined by the feudal-tribal organisation of society at certain stages of its development. The tribal system still remains a serious disintegrating factor in the life of many Arab countries. The level of national self-awareness in the tribal organisation is very low, which enhances the influence of particularist tendencies on the processes taking place in those countries.

1. Tribalism is an ideology of tribal self-isolation, "patriotism" and patriarchalism, an ideology deifying the tribal aristocracy, presumably a link between the rank-and-file members of a clan or tribe and the spirits of their ancestors, an ideology of blind obedience to the power and authority of the "chief" and his retinue and respect for them as the patrons and mentors of a clan or tribe.

ons, ideologies and religions. This cannot help hindering their rapprochement and often even contributes to their disunity, as, for instance, in cases when attempts to "undo" an historical injustice result in conflicts between states over national frontiers that took shape before liberation.

The ethnic composition of the population of former colonies is quite diverse despite their comparatively small territories. This is particularly true of the emergent West African states. For instance, today's Nigeria is inhabited by at least 235 ethnic groups speaking different languages and dialects, Ghana by about 60, Liberia by some 30, Mali by about 30 and Benin by more than ten tribes. Since the official languages are the languages of former metropolitan states (English or French), which often are not spoken by the majority of the population, who are mostly illiterate, particularly in the countryside, the processes of ethnic consolidation and the achievement of national unity in those countries are hampered to a large extent. Imperialism makes capital out of the ethnic and linguistic diversity of emergent African states, keeping inter-tribal differences smoldering and hampering the process of the emergence of nations and the growth of national self-awareness, which it regards as a threat to its neocolonialist interests. In so doing, it makes use of a diversity of methods, to the point of the forcible division of nationalities and tribes which have been traditionally living side by side.

For instance, the purposes of ethnic divisiveness are pursued today by the policy of bantustanisation, applied by the racist authorities of South Africa to the indigenous population of the unlawfully occupied Namibia. Bantustanisation is intended to prevent the formation of a single Namibian nation, which is regarded by the white colonialists and the tribal aristocracy as a threat to the regime of occupation securing their privileges. Colonialism remains loyal to its traditional "divide and rule" policy here as well.

It is possible to overcome tribal disunity and strife,

The problems of national consolidation are particularly acute because social differentiation in Latin American countries coincided with divisions into ethnic groups. As a result of the Spanish conquest, the indigenous population of the continent, the Indians, found themselves at the bottom rung of the social ladder, with the crossbreeds in the middle and the Creoles, considered the immediate descendants of the European population, constituting the upper strata of society. The indigenous population were mercilessly exploited and virtually plundered.

Today, there is a huge gap between the levels of the socio-economic, political, cultural and ideological development of different ethnic groups.

Relations Between Nationalities under Socialism

An examination of national (ethno-social) problems in different parts of the non-socialist world shows that

class and national oppression are inter-related and national oppression can only be eradicated if class inequality and oppression are eliminated.

The socialist revolution in Russia and the Soviet experience of remaking an exploiting society into a socialist one supplied the first ever example of the genuine solution of the nationality question. The Soviet experience, complemented by the practice of national transformations in other socialist countries, can be viewed as a qualitatively new stage in the development and solution of the nationality question, a stage which has a great historical significance.

The first decree of Soviet government - the Decree on Peace - legally embodied the principle of the self-determination of nations to the point of secession, the sovereign right of every nation to decide on the democratic principles and forms of state organisation. A series of legal acts established the principle of equality of big and small nations, disowned every claim of former Russian imperialism to dominance over non-Russian nations and nationalities, and repealed national and social estate privileges. Those documents included the Declaration of the Rights of the Peoples

Furthermore, other ethnic groups live side by side with the Arabs in Arab countries, in particular, Kurds in Iraq, Syria and Lebanon, Copts in Egypt, Armenians in Syria and Lebanon, Assyrians, Tajiks and Turkmen in Iraq, etc. Throughout the period of their rule the colonialists were striving to perpetuate the socio-ethnic differences between various groups of the population of the Arab countries and to turn those differences into antagonisms.

That is why the tasks of national and social emancipation, of resolving both national (ethno-social) and socio-economic, political and cultural problems simultaneously, are intertwined in a very complex and sometimes controversial way in the Arab countries. It is necessary to combine struggle for national liberation with struggle against any form of social relations of exploitation. That is why much importance is attached to the unity of all the democratic and anti-imperialist forces in the Arab region and to an even greater involvement of the Arab national liberation movement in the world revolutionary process.

The establishment of bourgeois nations has already completed or is nearing completion in most countries of Latin America. However, that process was to a great extent disfigured and held back by colonial rule, by the dominance of foreign capital and large landownership. Prior to the Spanish conquest the main forms of social community in Latin America were the clan and the tribe. The disintegration of erstwhile clan and tribal relationships after the Spanish conquest was followed by the establishment of territorial-production links, which provided the basis for the emergence of new nationalities in the colonial period, unstable at first. However, the persevering and consistent struggle of the indigenous population against the colonialists consolidated the incipient nationalities and prepared the ground for the subsequent emergence of nation-states.

The wars of independence waged in 1810-1826, which were akin to bourgeois revolutions, were the crucial period for the formation of nations in most of the former Spanish and Portuguese colonies. However, the process of the consolidation of nations was making different progress in different countries.

eradicated in the course of socialist cooperation and newly implemented specialisation of the economies of all republics and autonomous regions.

The establishment of an integral material and technical base of socialism in the Union Republics does not mean, of course, that their development is standardised by decree. It is common knowledge that some of the socialist nations emerged from the old, long-established ones, while others formed through the consolidation of nationalities and tribes which had bypassed capitalism or the phase of developed capitalism. There are also socialist nationalities which consolidated from among numerically small tribes and ethnical groups.

It is not only the elimination of antagonistic classes within socio-ethnic communities under socialism but also the obliteration of the socio-economic and class causes of their hostility towards other nations that constitute a major result of the transformation of these communities. The salvation or rebirth of a socio-ethnic community as a national entity, its transformation along socialist lines, its rapid economic and cultural progress and the realisation of the physical and spiritual potentialities of the nations to the utmost possible extent constitute a tendency for the flourishing of nations. This progressive tendency characterises mostly the direction and result of internal national development under socialism.

The tendency for the rapprochement of nations, also progressive, demonstrates the relationship of a given socio-ethnic community with other communities, both within the framework of a multi-national socialist state and with regard to other socialist nations. This tendency stems from the innermost nature of socialism, which facilitates and greatly accelerates the rapprochement of nations and their merger in the longer term. Of course, it will be a long historical process.

A new historical community of people, the Soviet people, is an embodiment of the Leninist theory of the rapprochement of nations in the course of building socialism, as the materials of the CPSU Congresses demonstrate. It is necessary to explain the meaning of this comparatively new concept,

of Russia, the Decrees on the Self-Determination of the Ukraine, Finland, Poland and Armenia and other historical documents the ideas of which were retained and given statutory force by the present-day Constitution of the USSR and the constitutions of the Union Republics.

The question of the national state organisation of non-Russian peoples plays a special role in the Leninist nationalities policy. The line for the establishment of sovereign national republics was substantiated and translated into practice in acute ideological and political struggle. At the same time Lenin directly linked the prospects of the world's first socialist country and the historic destinies of smaller nations to the military-political and economic alliance of Soviet republics. This alliance is a federation of equal socialist states based on voluntary association, fraternal cooperation and mutual assistance.

Naturally, the historical social experiment of the rejuvenation and rebirth of nations and their transformation along socialist lines is a long and arduous process. The situation was compounded by the fact that the numerous peoples of old Russia were at different levels of socio-economic development, some of them living under the patriarchal-clan system and others under capitalism.

In this situation it took the effective and sustained assistance of the Russian proletariat to the backward peoples of the Soviet Union to ensure their economic and cultural progress. The initial steps on that road were the mass-scale eradication of illiteracy, equality among women, their involvement in active social life, the development of transport, industry and civil engineering and the training of skilled labour, office workers and intellectuals from among the national population. The alliance of formerly backward peoples with the more developed nations in a single socialist state proved historically successful. It enabled every Union Republic to develop modern industry and mechanised agriculture and to train national personnel on a large scale.

All this made it possible to overcome actual inequality by evening out the economic and cultural development levels of all the nations. The social inequality of nations was

combination of international and national interests, the political consolidation of the peoples and the socialist integration of their economic life. They have a common language of inter-national communication between nations, which contributes to the cross-fertilisation of advancing socialist cultures, of the nations and nationalities of the Soviet Union.

The Soviet people constitute a historically new form of the community of people. It took shape within the territorial boundaries of the Soviet Union on the basis of socialist relations of production, the socialist way of life, and the ideological, political, cultural, moral and psychological unity of the classes, social groups, nations, nationalities and national minorities comprising it. This form of community represents an important historical period in the process of the rapprochement of nations and the overcoming of class differences.

From the point of view of theory, the Soviet people represent a transitory historical form of the social community of people. Obviously, the material and spiritual life of mankind is internationalised through the rapprochement and merger of nations and will give rise to new forms of the socio-historical community of people in communist society in the future.

A scholarly analysis of the practice of socialist transformations makes it possible to draw several important conclusions.

First, unlike capitalism, developed socialism has already proven that it is possible in principle to resolve the nationality question as the political problem of the eradication of national oppression and discrimination, the establishment of equality in rights and the achievement of de facto equality between socialist nations, nationalities and national minorities.

Second, the experience accumulated in the course of building socialism corroborates the dependence, discovered theoretically, of tendencies for the flourishing and rapprochement of nations on the revolutionary transformation of society along socialist lines.

Third, the new form of the socio-historical community

particularly in view of the fact that it also is falsified by bourgeois scholars. Among these falsifications are the notorious lies about "forcible Russification", about the USSR as a "unitary Russian state", about "denationalisation" of Autonomous and Union Republics and even about "Soviet colonialism".

It should be pointed out first and foremost that from the point of view of science the concept of people in societies divided into antagonistic classes does not coincide with the concepts of population and nation. The concept of population includes all the people living within definite national-state or regional borders regardless of their class, national, occupational or religious characteristics.

The theory of scientific socialism understands by the people the totality of classes, social groups and individuals determining by their social activity the progressive development of a country during a given historical period. In this sense the parasitic exploiting classes, social groups and strata, which objectively are opponents of social progress, constitute a force which is set in opposition to the people and are not included in that concept. Considering the Soviet people from this point of view, we realise that the absence of antagonistic and exploiting classes makes it possible to include in it the entire population of the country.

The multinational Soviet people as a historically new community are characterised by social unity, which is a consequence of the unity of their vital economic, political, national and ideological interests. The citizens of the country of developed socialism are equal workers free from exploitation, and active bearers of socialist relations of society. In national terms the Soviet people constitute a state association of nations and nationalities formed on a socialist basis.¹ This predetermines the unity and optimal

1. See Constitution (Fundamental Law) of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Section III, Novosti Press Agency, Publishing House, Moscow, 1982.

ethnography, anthropology and other sciences, has demonstrated that it is erroneous and groundless to identify the nation with the race and laid bare the reactionary class-based causes of such attempts. It showed that, unlike the nation, which is a social category, the race is a biological category, and that racial characteristics are not at all related to the characteristics of man as a social being nor can influence the development of society. The races were formed at the early stages of human evolution, long before the emergence of ethnic communities. They took shape under the influence of certain physical environments and under conditions of the isolated development of primitive human groups. The adaptation of the human organism to physical conditions over a long period of time manifested itself in certain morphological characteristics of the organisms of representatives of different races, which came to be known as racial characteristics. Racial differences between the representatives of the three main races, the black, or Negroid, the white, or Europoid, and the yellow, or Mongoloid, are limited to purely external features, such as colour, the shape of the lips, nose, and skull, the hair, etc. and do not affect the mental capabilities of man, his ability to work, his gifts, etc. Morphological differences between individual organs in people belonging to different races are negligent as compared with those common features which unite them into the single human species.

Present-day science has demonstrated that representatives of all the human races are connected by common origin and belong to the same human species. The unity of mankind as a species, against which racism is dead set, is confirmed by boundless possibilities for the mix-up of different human races (cross-breeding), by the ability of the progeny of inter-racial marriages to produce off-spring (which is not found in the progeny of different species in the animal world), and their viability and vitality in every respect.

Although racial differences are stable and hereditary, they are not eternal. In the course of their historical development races are intermixing, as a result of which not a single "pure" race exists today. In future, as the economic,

of people, the Soviet people, brought to life by the practice of the world's first country of developed socialism, illustrates the basic characteristics of the possible models and stages of the historical process of the rapprochement of nations. These models and stages, modified to varying degrees, are to be lived through by mankind as a whole.

Fourth and last, the peoples of the world have been supplied with sound arguments enabling them to make their choice. One way is to remain in the world of isolation and hostility among nations, in the world of national oppression and discrimination. The other is to choose the socialist alternative to all the types and forms of social and national slavery, to choose the world of fraternity, friendship, equality, mutual assistance among all people regardless of their racial and national origin.

Reactionary Essence of Racism

The concept of nation and that of race are often mixed up. Moreover, bourgeois scholars deliberately tangle

scholars deliberately tangle up this question in order to substitute biological categories for social ones and thus to prove the eternal, supra-historical character of nations and to make social and cultural differences between them seem insurmountable.

It is idealism that provides a common philosophical basis for bourgeois doctrines misrepresenting the nature of a national community. Hegel claimed in his day that nations and races constituted different stages of the self-determination of the "absolute spirit" and that every stage of its development was represented in history by a different people presumably having the right to regard other peoples as mere tools for the attainment of its historical goals. Present-day bourgeois sociologists (in particular, ethno-psychologists, who believe that some arcane "eternal" and "immutable" "national spirit", presumably towering over all class differences and removing them, constitutes the basic characteristic of a nation) have not renounced the division of nations into "superior" and "chosen", on the one hand, and "inferior" and "deranged", on the other.

Marxist sociology, which relies on the findings of

ethnography, anthropology and other sciences, has demonstrated that it is erroneous and groundless to identify the nation with the race and laid bare the reactionary class-based causes of such attempts. It showed that, unlike the nation, which is a social category, the race is a biological category, and that racial characteristics are not at all related to the characteristics of man as a social being nor can influence the development of society. The races were formed at the early stages of human evolution, long before the emergence of ethnic communities. They took shape under the influence of certain physical environments and under conditions of the isolated development of primitive human groups. The adaptation of the human organism to physical conditions over a long period of time manifested itself in certain morphological characteristics of the organisms of representatives of different races, which came to be known as racial characteristics. Racial differences between the representatives of the three main races, the black, or Negroid, the white, or Europoid, and the yellow, or Mongoloid, are limited to purely external features, such as colour, the shape of the lips, nose, and skull, the hair, etc. and do not affect the mental capabilities of man, his ability to work, his gifts, etc. Morphological differences between individual organs in people belonging to different races are negligent as compared with those common features which unite them into the single human species.

Present-day science has demonstrated that representatives of all the human races are connected by common origin and belong to the same human species. The unity of mankind as a species, against which racism is dead set, is confirmed by boundless possibilities for the mix-up of different human races (cross-breeding), by the ability of the progeny of inter-racial marriages to produce off-spring (which is not found in the progeny of different species in the animal world), and their viability and vitality in every respect.

Although racial differences are stable and hereditary, they are not eternal. In the course of their historical development races are intermixing, as a result of which not a single "pure" race exists today. In future, as the economic,

of people, the Soviet people, brought to life by the practice of the world's first country of developed socialism, illustrates the basic characteristics of the possible models and stages of the historical process of the rapprochement of nations. These models and stages, modified to varying degrees, are to be lived through by mankind as a whole.

Fourth and last, the peoples of the world have been supplied with sound arguments enabling them to make their choice. One way is to remain in the world of isolation and hostility among nations, in the world of national oppression and discrimination. The other is to choose the socialist alternative to all the types and forms of social and national slavery, to choose the world of fraternity, friendship, equality, mutual assistance among all people regardless of their racial and national origin.

Reactionary Essence of Racism

The concept of nation and that of race are often mixed up. Moreover, bourgeois scholars deliberately tangle up this question in order to substitute biological categories for social ones and thus to prove the eternal, supra-historical character of nations and to make social and cultural differences between them seem insurmountable.

It is idealism that provides a common philosophical basis for bourgeois doctrines misrepresenting the nature of a national community. Hegel claimed in his day that nations and races constituted different stages of the self-determination of the "absolute spirit" and that every stage of its development was represented in history by a different people presumably having the right to regard other peoples as mere tools for the attainment of its historical goals. Present-day bourgeois sociologists (in particular, ethno-psychologists, who believe that some arcane "eternal" and "immutable" "national spirit", presumably towering over all class differences and removing them, constitutes the basic characteristic of a nation) have not renounced the division of nations into "superior" and "chosen", on the one hand, and "inferior" and "deranged", on the other.

Marxist sociology, which relies on the findings of

Soviet Union and the other countries of the socialist community have eliminated the very breeding ground of the ideology and policy of racism.

Polarity of Nationalism and Proletarian Internationalism

Socialism and capitalism display fundamentally different approaches and policies in their tackling of the nationality question.

The complexity and acuteness of the nationality question in the non-socialist world and deep-rooted prejudices and over-sensitivity of people to relations between nationalities make special demands on the ideological, theoretical and political struggle in this field. Differences of opinion are often caused by the fact that different, sometimes opposite meanings are imputed to the concept of "nationalism".

The characteristics of nationalism that are cited most often include love for one's ethnic community, race, home country, language and historical culture, the loyalty of the individual to a nation-state, the natural and spontaneous solidarity of representatives of a given nation, concern for its prestige, etc. This interpretation of nationalism, as we see, is based first and foremost on the phenomena of human mentality, culture and language. The substitution of subjective factors for the objective foundations of nationalism as a social phenomena and disregard for its class content are the common features of this interpretation of nationalism, which identifies the national and the nationalistic.

The socio-political basis of the transformation of the national into the nationalistic consists in relations of dominance of some nations and nationalities over others; in economic, social and cultural differences between socio-ethnic communities; in basic qualitative transformations of socio-ethnic communities (e.g., the formation or transformation of nations and nationalities); in the conservative continuity of traditions, lifestyles, customs and religious cults of a given socio-ethnic community; in the consolidation and survival of nationalistic prejudices, mores and views, particularly in cases of social conflicts.

social, cultural and biological interaction of the peoples of different continents intensifies, the races will be more and more "diluted" and "eroded", the areas occupied by them superimposed and transformed, and racial differences obliterated. The ultimate result of this complex and sustained process will be a future communist society, homogeneous not only socially but, to a large extent, racially as well.

The history of the emergence of today's nations debunks the racist concoctions about the fundamental social incompatibility of representatives of different races and the impossibility for them to live as one nation. Such mixed nations are exemplified by the North American, Italian and French nations, which imbibed and assimilated alongside whites quite a few blacks. Nations were formed in a number of Latin American countries through the merger of different racial groups, which actually dissolved in one another.

History has passed its verdict on colonialism and racism. The very defeat of colonialism in Africa is graphic proof of the absurdity of the racist theories of the so-called "dominant" and "slave" races. The assertions that the human races are unequal and that "superior" races are biologically predetermined to dominate the "inferior" ones, which are presumably incapable of independent scientific, technical, social and cultural creative activity, are fallacious scientifically, reactionary politically, and are debunked by the practice of the comprehensive rebirth of Africa, vigorously struggling for a better future.

The genuine solution of racial problems is made possible not by the division and disunity of the peoples but by the consolidation of all the progressive forces regardless of the racial and national groups to which their representatives belong.

No good intentions or declarations with regard to overcoming racial oppression and hostility can put an end to racism as a social phenomenon while the source generating and constantly feeding it, the system of capitalist exploitation, exists. The genuine solution of racial problems presupposes the obliteration of the system of capitalist exploitation. Having put an end to exploitation of man by man, the

With the onset of imperialism the contents of nationalism change and it becomes a tool of neo-colonialist policy, aggressive and bellicose. Sometimes it grows into its extreme form, chauvinism, with disregard for the interests of other nations becoming hostility and even hatred for them. Chauvinism is usually accompanied by racism, preaching intolerance of the peoples of other races under the pretext of their inferiority. Racism and chauvinism are the ideology of the more reactionary circles of the bourgeoisie or other social strata.

Imperialism has revived and given a new social meaning to cosmopolitanism. The latter is a warped reflection of the objective tendency for economic integration and the factor of nationality, often exploited in the interest of national culture and national sovereignty and upholds, directly or indirectly, the interests of supra-national monopolies.

Petty-bourgeois nationalism represents predominantly the interests of the so-called middle strata, their lifestyles, activity and world outlook. The dual social status of the middle strata explains their contradictory attitude to national relations and problems. On the one hand, the petty-bourgeoisie is susceptible to ideas of national community and often regards the protection of national interests as a possibility to overcome the instability and duality of its position in society. On the other, it often easily falls for nationalistic hysteria and serves as a vehicle of the nationalism of the ruling bourgeoisie and its breeding ground.

Manifestations of nationalism in the countries which acquired national statehood comparatively recently differ in many respects from the forms of the manifestation of bourgeois nationalism. In these countries certain nationalist phenomena are traced back to their pre-colonial past, while others are born of the opposition of the oppressed peoples to the colonial and neocolonial actions of imperialism. Some nationalist tendencies have emerged comparatively recently, in the course of social transformations with the establishment of independent states.

One of the forms produced by the national liberation movement is the conservative protective nationalism of the local

Nationalism, unlike national interests, consists in the exploitation of the factor of nationality by certain social groups, classes and political groupings to achieve their special ends in domestic and foreign policies, to camouflage the self-interest of the dominant class with the interests of the nation as a whole, and to blur irreconcilable class contradictions within a nation. Nationalism in any form actually is the psychology, ideology, policy and social practice of the isolation of the mass of working people of one socio-ethnic or national community from that of another, and the setting of one in opposition to the other.

A characteristic of the forms of nationalism from class positions prepares the ground for its scholarly classification. The historical types of nationalism are characterised by a reflection of specific national (socio-ethnic) and class relations in corresponding socio-economic formations.

Bourgeois nationalism as a historical type emerges with the consolidation of the economic and political positions of the bourgeoisie in its struggle against feudalism. It immediately manifests its two aspects, the first expressing the progressive tendencies of the emerging bourgeoisie and the second related to the exploitation of the factor of nationality by it to camouflage its class interests. As the bourgeoisie loses its historically progressive role, that latter aspect becomes the main content of bourgeois nationalism. It should be noted that nationalistic tendencies in the emergent states, which were former colonies, are rising in a different historical period and under different historical conditions and therefore should not be identified with "classical" bourgeois nationalism.

Present-day capitalism is characterised by the nationalism of the ruling bourgeoisie and by petty-bourgeois nationalism. The more widespread form of nationalism is great-power chauvinism, which aims to rationalise the dominance of bourgeois nations over national minorities within a given country, and also over dependent peoples. It is exemplified by white chauvinism in such countries of state-monopoly capitalism as the United States and Britain towards national minorities, and in West Germany towards numerous immigrant workers.

aims."¹ What then is the individual as a subject of history? What is its nature and the basic laws governing its development?

The Concept of the Individual

Before answering these questions, it is necessary to give brief definitions of the basic concepts of the "individual", "man", "person" and "individuality". While being generally coincident in scope, they differ in meaning.

The concept "individual" (from Latin "in" - negation, and "divido" - divide) is used to denote individual representatives of the human race. The individual is a human being as a single and indivisible entity. The concept "man" reflects the more general biological and social characteristics of homo sapiens. However, man is first and foremost a social being. The concept "individual" reflects precisely the totality of social characteristics of man. The individual is a vehicle of social characteristics. Obviously, every human being is a unique and inimitable combination of these social characteristics plus the natural biological features of that particular person. The concept "individuality" reflects this inimitable singularity of a human being in the full entirety of its biological and social characteristics.

The principle of activity in accordance with which the individual is formed and develops only to the extent of the active assimilation by him of culture as a subject of objective actions is the cornerstone of the Marxist theory of the individual. There are diverse forms of this activity, such as cognitive, communicative, artistic creative, etc., but it is material production that plays the decisive role in the development of the individual and society. This is the basic tenet of historical materialism. "As individuals express their life, so they are. What they are, therefore, coincides with their production, both with what they produce and with how they produce. Hence what individuals are depends on the

¹. K. Marx, F. Engels, Collected Works, Vol. 4, p. 93.

oligarchy. This oligarchy is represented in different countries either by tribal aristocracy or by feudal lords, or by large landowners (latifundists), or by the compradore bourgeoisie and officialdom of the former colonial administration. Another form of nationalism, fomented and incited by imperialist monopolies in every way, is tribalism, i.e., discord and hostility between tribes.

These countries also feature different forms of religious nationalism (Buddhist, Islamic, etc.), black or coloured racism, different types of what is called continental nationalism (Asian, African), concepts of national originality (Negritude), etc.

All these forms of nationalism are exploited by international monopolies and local oligarchies to consolidate their positions and to weaken the national liberation movements. At the same time, obviously, they reflect in a warped way social protest against colonialism, neo-colonialism, discrimination and inequality. That is why the Communists, waging their ideological and political struggle, have to decide the question of their attitude to nationalism as a political problem.

The approach of the proletariat to national relations from a class position is manifest in the fact that it upholds simultaneously patriotism (as love of one's home country) and internationalism, while rejecting national narrow-mindedness. Purposeful, vigorous and effective struggle against bourgeois nationalistic conceptions is an important condition of the revolutionary education and cohesion of all the working people.

7. The Individual and Society

The Marxist analysis of the dialectics of social development presupposes the formulation and solution of the problem of the individual, because every human society, whatever its form, is a product of the interaction of people, and it is man who is the main element of any social system. "History does nothing," Marx and Engels wrote, "it 'possesses no immense wealth', it 'wages no battles'. It is man, real, living man who does all that, who possesses and fights... - History is nothing but the activity of man pursuing his

subject of creative activity in culture and history, Marxism overcame the contemplative nature of old materialism. Man changes himself only to the extent he transforms the world.

In this way the interrelationship between the individual and society is effected not directly but is mediated through labour as the individual masters social reality in his practical activity.

Recognition of the decisive role of the social environment in the development of the individual should not lead to the exaggeration of this influence and conceal certain natural and biological elements in its structure (such as sex, age, health, temperament, inclinations, etc.). The existence of these properties considerably complicates the socialisation of the individual, which is not reduced to the standard involvement of human beings in the system of social relations but always takes place on the basis of individual natural and biological conditions, and this should be reckoned with in drafting social programmes and policies. For instance, acceleration, i.e., the accelerated psychological and physical maturing of present-day teenagers, gives a new dimension to the problem of their education and upbringing, while the gradual ageing of the world population, is generating serious demographic and economic problems.

Underestimation of national and biological factors leads to abstract sociologism, but overestimation of this role is no less erroneous, as it results in biologism in the conception of the individual.

There are diverse manifestations of biologism. Fraudianism, for instance, absolutises the role of biological instincts in human behaviour. As for social factors, they only play a negative role, suppressing biological instincts into the subconscious. Hence the conclusion that social progress is determined by the struggle between two opposite instincts, eros, the sexual instinct of life and self-realisation, and tanatos, the aggressive and destructive death instinct. Another interpretation of biologism holds it that all wars and conflicts spring from the "aggressive genes" in man and that wars are bound to accompany the human race until science restructures man's genetic apparatus. Lastly, one of

material conditions of their production."¹

Man is judged not by his appearance but by his deeds. It is in his actions that man is formed and manifests himself as the individual. Lenin pointed out that the direct participation of the mass of people in socio-political actions is an important condition of the fostering of political awareness in them and the formation of their revolutionary qualities.

The interpretation of the individual as the subject of material activity of necessity leads to the recognition of its social essence. Man always realises himself through a social being, the individual. Marxism views the essence of the individual as a result of social relations engendered by human activity. "... The essence of man is no abstraction inherent in each single individual. In its reality it is the ensemble of the social relations."²

Such an approach spelt a genuine revolution in the views on the individual because it offered an opportunity to study the subject scientifically. The individual acts here not as a chance, singular phenomenon with its own essence but as a social phenomenon developing in accordance with necessary social laws. On the other hand, society is not a mechanical summation of abstract individuals but an organic system of historically conditioned forms of the people's joint activity.

In his activity man is in numerous ways connected with his social environment. That is why the social environment is a key source of man's development as the individual. Prior to Marx, materialists also recognised that the "environment" affected the individual but they regarded the process as a primarily one-sided influence exercised by the "environment" of the individual, which acts as a passive object of that influence. In its teaching of the individual as an active

1. K. Marx, F. Engels, Collected Works, Vol. 5, pp. 31-32.
2. Ibid., p. 4

achieved through the complete "dissolution" of the individual in a human group bound by blood relationships. Even proper names at first denoted not so much specific individuals as their belonging to a certain clan. It was not the individual but the clan that was the real subject of activity. That underdeveloped character of individuality was an intrinsic need of the clan system; the productive forces were so primitive that any possibility of individual activity was ruled out. It was only in joint, collective work that man could sustain his existence and survive as a species, and it was therefore necessary strictly to regulate all the functions of the individuals making up the group. Hence, the conservatism of primitive society and its strict observance of the customs and rituals sanctified by ancient mythology and religion.

The period of the disintegration of the clan system was characterised by the gradual differentiation of social life that destroyed the immediate unity of the individual and society. That process of social stratification was at first limited and determined not so much by social as by biological causes: even chiefs initially were chosen according to natural and biological characteristics, such as age and physical strength. The development of the labour activity of people, gradually bringing about the division of labour within society, played the decisive role in accelerating the rise of the individual. New diverse forms of activity called for greater independence and self-reliance on the part of individual people. However, relations of private property, which had emerged as a result of the division of labour, and class antagonisms born of it stood in the way of overcoming the total dependence of the individual on the social organism. In slave-owning society, the slave - the "talking tool" - was beholden to his owner, and in feudal society, the behaviour of individual people was wholly determined and regulated by their belonging to specific social estates.

The rise of capitalism meant another step forward in the development of the individual, which consisted in the ultimate liberation of the person from mediaeval isolationism, seclusion and personal dependence on his or her master. This

the more reactionary political projections of biolgism is racism attempting to justify discrimination on racial and national grounds by the doctrine of the "inferior biological type" of individual races.

As for Marxism, it recognises a certain role of natural and biological factors in the development of the individual but believes that its character is shaped up by social circumstances, because no biological characteristic contributes to the formation of the personality. Marx noted: "...The essence of a 'particular personality' is not its beard, its blood, its abstract physical character, but its social quality..."¹

The personality, being both the object and the subject of the historical process, is always developing in historically predetermined social circumstances, which depend in the final analysis on the system of relations of production prevailing in a given society. Every socio-economic formation gives rise to its specific historical types of personality, which represent its basic socio-class and economic features, e.g., the slave and the slave-owner, the serf and the feudal lord, the proletarian and the capitalist, etc. Of course, each of these classic social types manifests itself in the concrete behaviour of individual people in an original, individualised way. At the same time an analysis of the basic historical stages in the development of the individual identifies in this process interesting peculiarities and recurrent law-governed phenomena.

The Individual in the History of Society

Primitive society is characterised by the extremely underdeveloped nature of the self-expression of its members as individuals. Objectively this is due to the quite rudimentary development of the productive forces, as a result of which different forms of human activity were poorly differentiated. The unity of the individual and society was immediate and therefore underdeveloped and limited, and was

1. K. Marx, F. Engels, Collected Works, Vol. 3, p. 21.

restricted by the rigid requirements of definite social orders. Similar processes are taking place in socio-political relations. The bureaucratisation of the state machinery, political parties, trade unions and other non-government organisations that is typical of present-day capitalism is a manifestation of the depersonalisation of individuals and their becoming "functionaries" serving the totalitarian bureaucratic system.

Wealth is the end and man the means - this inhuman formula reflects the essence of capitalism. However, it is this circumstance that is consistently disregarded by the proponents of the capitalist way of life. Juggling with average economic indicators, they claim that "mass consumer society" is superior to socialism. However, it is not the economic but the humanistic criterion, based on the degree of development of human personality, that is the main yardstick. It is not a social system characterised by industrial and technological abundance that is more progressive but a system using the entire abundance achieved by society for the benefit of its every member. Can we say, for instance, that the USA is a thriving country if it is the world's leader in the crime rate and organised gangsterism, in drug addiction and suicides, and if unemployment and inflation have long become inseparable from the American way of life? Is it a chance that 18 million (36 per cent) out of the 50 million mental patients in today's world, according to World Health Organisation statistics, live in the United States? Marx wrote: "As compared to any other mode of production the capitalist mode of production is much more extravagant in respect of man and his live labour. It squanders not only his flesh and blood, his physical strength, but also his intellectual and nervous energy... . The general development of individuals is only achieved at the expense of the greatest harm done to every particular individual in those historical epochs which are the prelude to the socialist organisation of human society."¹

1. K. Marx, F. Engels, Works, Vol. 47, p. 186 (in Russian).

progress was determined by the very character of capitalist production, which normally needed independent persons freely selling their labour on the capitalist market. The bourgeoisie "has been the first to show what man's activity can bring about",¹ and it is in the development and growing complexity of its forms that lie the sources of that upsurge of the self-awareness of the individual that was characteristic of emergent capitalist society. Having a need for independent, energetic, businesslike and enterprising people, that society made militant individualism the basic principle of its development.

However, the further development of capitalism, accompanied by the exacerbation of the antagonism between social character of labour and the private capitalist form of appropriation, gradually made the individual more and more economically dependent on the results of its activity thus generating a conflict between personal and social interests. Marx characterised that situation as alienation. Alienation is the process and result of the movement of private property in the course of which people themselves produce what is turned against them. The worker in capitalist society cannot dispose of the results of his work. They belong to the capitalist and are used by him to enrich himself through exploitation.

Work done by man is taking particularly disfigured and antagonistic forms in present-day capitalist society. "Men are effaced by their labour... Time is everything, man is nothing; he is, at the most, time's carcase."² The main goal of the process of capitalist production is the sustained growth of the material mass of wealth, while the development of individual people is only considered a means to ensure this growth.

This dehumanising process is inexorably embracing every form of human activity. Even in the sphere of intellectual production there emerge categories of workers whose activity is regulated by bureaucratic decrees "from above" and is

-
1. K. Marx, F. Engels, Collected Works, Vol. 6, p. 487.
 2. K. Marx, F. Engels, Collected Works, Vol. 6, p. 127.

Collectivism means mutual assistance and cooperation among people and harmonious interrelation of individual and social interests. The interests of the individual are subordinated to those of society, as this is required for the free development of everyone. "Only within the community has each individual the means of cultivating his gifts in all directions; hence personal freedom becomes possible only within the community."¹

The preceding historical epochs produced only surrogate collectivism that restricted the freedom of the individual. In primitive society, freedom was curtailed by hard living conditions and by the need to wage an uphill struggle with nature. In society divided into classes this problem is compounded by people's dependence on social forces. In bourgeois society, the worker, who is formally free and independent, finds himself in economic bondage to the owner of the means of production, to whom he has to sell his labour power. The transition from capitalism to socialism and communism means nothing but, as Engels put it, a "leap from the kingdom of necessity to the kingdom of freedom".² Socialist society, which emancipates the individual from exploitation, creates conditions for the genuine freedom of the individual on the basis of community of individual and social interests.

The decisive role in achieving this community is played by socialist work collectives, which constitute an important element of the political system of socialist society. "Work collectives take part in discussing and deciding state and public affairs, in planning production and social development, in training and placing personnel, and in discussing and deciding matters pertaining to the management of enterprises and institutions, the improvement of working and living conditions, and the use of funds allocated both for developing production and for social and cultural purposes

1. K. Marx, F. Engels, Collected Works, Vol. 5, p. 78.

2. F. Engels, Anti-Dühring, p. 344.

The antagonism between individual and social interests under capitalism gives rise to such social types of the individual, characteristic of capitalism, as a conformist who adjusts to existing totalitarian and bureaucratic structures; an outcast who finds refuge from social conflicts in counterculture of drugs; an anarchist who is bent on breaking up the existing relationships by all means, including terrorism. However, the development of capitalism at present is also characterised by the mounting class struggle of the proletariat against the sway of monopolies and for peace, progress and socialism. The social type of proletarian revolutionary emerges as a result of this struggle. His hallmarks include high principledness, discipline, combination of "socialist knowledge and revolutionary experience" (Lenin), loyalty to socialist ideals and a well-developed sense of collectivism.

The antagonism between the individual and society will be eventually resolved only in a communist society. All the antagonistic formations treated the individual as a tool for developing production, while under communism the individual is the ultimate goal of production. In all the antagonistic formations the exploiting minority could develop only by alienating itself from the development of the exploited majority, while under communism a society emerges which makes "free development of everyone a condition for free development of all". In all the antagonistic formations the development of the individual was restricted and, generally, spontaneous, while communism sets out, for the first time in history, to systematically develop every single member of society towards boundless perfection.

All these distinctive features of communism become evident already at its first stage, in socialist society. As the property of the whole people asserts itself, the antagonism between individual and social interests, responsible for the emergence of individualism as the principle of relations between people, dies away. The community of basic interests of all social groups is a hallmark of socialism. That explains why collectivism is the main principle of social relations under socialism permeating every sphere of social life.

one side, there is phoney collectivism which is levelling out the individual, reducing it to a mere puppet on the historical scene. Marx called this approach primitive, barrack communism. "This type of communism - since it negates the personality of man in every sphere - is but the logical expression of private property ..."¹ This kind of deviation from the principles of collectivism is found in the theory and practice of Maoism as well as in the criminal "Pol Pot experiment", which took the toll of over three million lives during a short period of time.

The other deviation, organically connected with the first one, is the cult of the individual. It consists in the over-estimation of the role of individual personalities in the historical process. The cult of the individual underestimates the role of the mass of the people in the process of making history. By restricting and suppressing the initiative of the working people, it fosters in them submissiveness, passive waiting for directives "from above", in other words, revives in a peculiar form the bourgeois idealistic theory of "heroes" and "mob".

Marxist denunciation of the cult of the individual has nothing to do with the anarchist negation of authority. History shows that the working class, waging an uphill worldwide struggle for its complete emancipation, cannot do without authorities. However, while the cult of the individual asserted itself in the estrangement from the people, the genuine leader wins his prestige by relying on the mass of the people, who express in this way their trust in him.

Accepting the role of authorities and outstanding personalities, socialist society aims at the comprehensive development of every single individual. The main condition for the individual's comprehensive and harmonious development is improvement of the forms of its activity in material production on the basis of scientific and technological progress. This is bound to bring about a dramatic change in the character of man's work.

1. K. Marx, F. Engels, Collected Works, Vol. 3, p. 295.

and financial incentives."¹

Work for society gives rise to a qualitatively new, socialist type of the individual, characterised by a mature sense of collectivism and patriotism, a high level of ethical and spiritual culture, and communist ideology.

The Marxist view of collectivism as a form of development of the individual comes under sharp attacks from opponents of communism. They allege that communist collectivism and the freedom of the individual are incompatible. Moreover, freedom itself is regarded as absolute independence of the individual from the diktat of social norms. A conclusion prompts itself that "human rights and freedoms are regularly violated" in socialist society, in which the individual is presumably a victim of a "totalitarian political regime".

Marxism lays bare the fallacy of these attacks. First, one cannot live in a society and be free from it, as has been long proved by historical practice. Second, the concept "absolute freedom" is extra-historical and abstract, while Marxism demands a concrete, historical and class-based approach to the concept of freedom, dismissing any other theory as hypocrisy. Third, the rights and freedoms of the individual in any society are indissolubly linked with the individual's responsibilities, otherwise life in a group is impossible. It is noteworthy that what constitutes the rights and freedoms of the individual becomes responsibilities for society (the state). To sum it all up, all anti-communist claims that the free development of the individual is incompatible with the principles of collectivism are based on an abstract view of freedom as "absolute independence" from society. This view manifests itself, specifically, in human rights and freedoms being metaphysically divorced from man's responsibilities.

While acknowledging the decisive role of collectivism in moulding the socialist individual, Marxism is strongly against two opposite deviations from this principle. On the

1. Constitution (Fundamental Law) of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, p. 17.

becomes possible only when men are no longer crippled by the division of labour based on highly-developed material production, which constitutes the main link in this synthesis.

The Family and the Individual

Man's reproduction of his existence consists of two interrelated processes, namely, production of the

means of subsistence and production of people themselves, i.e., child-bearing and socialisation of individuals. While the primary social form of the former process is the work collective, that of the latter is the family. The family is one of the so-called small social groups which, unlike large social groups, such as classes and nations, are characterised by personal contacts between their members and, accordingly, by interdependence of personal and social interests.

The family is a small social group based on marriage or on blood relationship; it is an historically evolved relationship between husband and wife or parents and children, its members being connected by commonality of living conditions, mutual assistance and mutual moral and legal responsibilities. Marriage as the basis of the family is an historical form of relationship between woman and man by which society sanctions and regulates their cohabitation and establishes their conjugal and parental rights and responsibilities. The most important social function of marriage is to ensure the stability of the family and of the upbringing of children (socialisation of the individual).

Historically, the family emerged later than marriage, being a result of the sustained development and transformation of conjugal relations. "These modifications are of such a character that the circle of people embraced by the tie of common marriage -- very wide originally -- becomes narrower and narrower, until, finally, only the single couple is left, which predominates today."¹

1. K. Marx and F. Engels, Selected Works in three volumes, Vol. 3, p. 211.

On the one hand, working time will be drastically cut down, and off-hours needed for the free development of the individual will increase. Herein lie the roots of a fundamental shifts in the socio-cultural environment, a shift which will be linked with transition from "prehistory" of human society to its "history", with a leap from the "realm of necessity" into the "realm of freedom", with the withering away of the law of value and with the assertion of the main law of communist society, the law of the comprehensive and harmonious development of the individual.

On the other hand, work will change qualitatively, making it possible for people in principle to take part in every form of human activity that history has produced and to give up one for another of their own accord.

The harmonious development of the individual is a necessary condition for his comprehensive development. In the period of transition to communism, there are greater opportunities of educating a new man, who will harmoniously combine spiritual wealth, moral purity and a perfect physique. The harmonious development of man is therefore linked with the unity of the opposites, e.g. of the biological and the social, the physical and the spiritual, etc. However, "these opposites can be combined either into a cacophony or a symphony".¹ What are the conditions for attaining genuine harmony?

To begin with, harmony in the combination of the opposites does not yet mean a direct connection between them. This connection only indicates the underdevelopment of the individual and society rather than harmony. You can make a violinist take up a hammer and a blacksmith a violin. Neither will produce harmony. Harmony is to be found only where and when non-antagonistic opposites are synthesised in a mediated manner, i.e., complementing and enhancing each other in the process of their development. The dominant development of certain aspects of the individual is necessary for the manifestation of his unique and inimitable properties and contributes to the development of all its other aspects. This

¹. V.I. Lenin, Collected Works, Vol. 32, p. 28.

tions of polygamy, the marital union of one man with a group of women. In all cases the form of marital and family relations depends on specific socio-economic conditions, in particular, on the demographic factor of the numerical correlation of the sexes and also on national, cultural and religious traditions.

The monogamous family is characterised by a certain duality due to the presence of both the economic and the moral and psychological (private) aspect. On the one hand, monogamy gave an impetus to the development of production by ensuring the accumulation of material and spiritual values and the transfer of production experience. On the other, it contributed to the development of the individual, to a better understanding of its spiritual world, to the formation of such moral qualities as responsibility, altruism, etc. Moreover, child-rearing was for many people, primarily women, all but the only form of their self-assertion in the world of exploitation and oppression.

In bourgeois society, this contradictory duality of the monogamous family assumes the form of conflict. "The bourgeoisie has torn away from the family its sentimental veil, and has reduced the family relation to a mere money relation."¹ The contradiction between the dominance of economic interests in family relations and the selectivity of private feelings and sentiments tends to destroy the family and marriage.

Capitalism, undoubtedly, gave rise to progressive socio-economic reforms contributing to the advance of the family, such as the large-scale involvement of women in social production, the development of the health protection system, public education, the services, etc. However, the positive results of these reforms are constrained by negative tendencies in the social policies of bourgeois society, such as economic and political discrimination against women, paid health service, education, etc. The contradiction between these two tendencies, the overall economic and spiritual progress of society under capitalism and the utilitarian and consumer forms of exploiting it constitute the main driving

1. K. Marx, F. Engels, Collected Works, Vol. 6, p. 487.

The rise of primitive society was characterised by extremely disordered conjugal relations. The low development level of material production made it impossible to single out individual families from a clan collective, while the isolationism of primitive tribes made it both possible and necessary the incest. The "dissolution" of the individual in the collective and the underdeveloped character of his qualities as a personality, mentioned above, were manifest in this respect in the complete absence of jealousy and individual love, which arose at a far later date.

The next stage in the development of conjugal relations consisted in the gradual exclusion of sexual contact between representatives of different generations and, still later, between blood relatives. The main form of conjugal relations in primitive society was what is called group marriage, presupposing sexual contacts between a group of men of one clan with a group of women of another clan. Similar marital forms can be found even today among American Indian tribes and in a number of other surviving ethno-social groups.

A form of transition from group marriage to monogamy was pair marriage, which emerged at the final stage of the development of primitive-communal system and presupposed monogamy which could be easily dissolved by either side. The progress of material production, resulting in the emergence of private property, gave rise to a qualitatively new type of marital union, based on monogamy and on man's prevalence in the family, which was dictated by the need to amass wealth and to ensure that it was passed on to heirs. That was how monogamy, the conjugal union of one man with one woman, emerged. Its first classical form was what is called the patriarchal family, which included not only all the blood relatives on the father's side but also domestic slaves (the Latin "familia" means the totality of slaves belonging to one person).

In addition to the above "classical forms" of marital and family relations, there existed in the history of society - and have survived in certain places -- different transitory and mixed forms. For instance, monogamy, which prevails in present-day society, is complemented by different manifesta-

transition to the communist principle of distribution according to need make it important to develop man's cultural requirements. The task of the socialist family is to contribute as effectively as possible to the solution of this problem.

In spiritual life, the main function of the socialist family is child-rearing, that is, the socialisation of the individual. The fact that the education of the young generation is a cause of all society under socialism in no way detracts from the role of the family. It is the family that forms that micro-environment in which the educational efforts of the state and society are resulted in a positive (and sometimes negative) cultural effect.

The tasks of education are closely related to such a function of the socialist family as the organisation of free time. In every type of exploiting society the state only concerned itself with organising the working time of the exploited. Socialism for the first time in history made man's free time a social value, realising that its rational use was a major condition for the development of the individual. The accomplishment of this task depends largely on the efforts of the socialist family, because the possibilities of social and legal regulation are insufficient in this area. All this enhances the role of moral factors in the development of the family.

Naturally, the socialist family runs into certain difficulties and problems in the course of its development, such as lingering differences between the living standards and lifestyles of individual families, which fact restricts the possibilities for the adequate fulfilment of the functions of the family; a relatively high divorce rate and low birth rate, particularly in areas of intensive migration and large-scale urbanisation; inadequately developed services; petty-bourgeois survivals making themselves felt in the mentality and behaviour of members of individual families, etc. However, the social policy pursued by the socialist state aims at promptly resolving these problems.

force of the development of marital and family relations in capitalist society.

It is "consumer society" that is the main cause of the devaluation and disintegration of the family and the breakdown of the traditional forms of marital relations. These processes are manifest in the growing number of suicides and baby-killings, in the soaring divorce rate and pre- and extra-marital sexual contacts, and in the growing range of sexual perversions. All sorts of hypersexualisation of social life, extensively used by representatives of leftist groupings in their pseudo-revolutionary theory and practice, objectively serve the interests of the bourgeoisie, because, misguiding social practice, they contribute to the perpetuation of the system of capitalist exploitation.

The proletarian family is quite different. It is no longer a private proprietor, i.e., an economic unit of capitalist society, and for this reason such family is the harbinger of non-religious marriage based on love.

By doing away with the private ownership of the means of production, the socialist revolution leads to a radical restructuring of marital and family relations, to the assertion in them of such qualitatively new, socialist principles as free will of man and woman in marrying each other, complete equality and mutual respect between husband and wife, love as the basis of marriage, new, communist morality, etc.

The socialist restructuring of marital and family relations makes itself felt in the changed functions of the family as well. In bourgeois society, the basic function of the family is to amass material wealth, which is bound to lead to the underestimation of spiritual and moral values and therefore to the degradation of the individual. With the transition to socialism, the family is no longer a wealth-accumulating unit. The economic basis of the socialist family is personal rather than private property, which is formed through the socially useful work of the members of the family. The main material function of the socialist family is to organise the consumption of the results of this work. The advance of society towards communism and the gradual

state and eventually result in the disappearance of the family in communist society? It is this point of view that certain simplistic and dogmatic interpreters and revisionists like Roger Garaudy, try to impute to it; the latter believes, for instance, that "today it is hard to preserve for the family even some of the foundations that have been characteristic of it for centuries."

These assertions are nothing new, nor are they true. Way back in the 19th century, the outstanding thinkers, from the utopian socialist Fourier to Babel, believed that traditional family relationships would disintegrate in a future society. The meaning of their discourses was that since the monogamous family was a product of private property, the abolition of private property would lead to the withering away of the family. The founders of Marxism were strongly opposed to this simplistic and vulgar conclusion in the spirit of "barrack communism". However, nowadays similar views are peddled by fringe "left"-wing petty-bourgeois ideologists.

The main shortcoming of all these conceptions is that they disregard the substantial differences between the traditional system of economic relations in the monogamous family, on the one hand, and the system of spiritual and moral relations that are characteristic of it, on the other. As a consequence, being aware of the need for changing the former, they metaphysically reject the possibility of retaining the latter, which, naturally, prompts gloomy forecasts for future of the family and marriage.

The communist family is a dialectical negation of "classical monogamy." Doing away with those aspects of family relations which in the final analysis were a product of private property and underdevelopment of social production, it retains all the moral and spiritual values accumulated by monogamy, including love, motherhood, etc. Moreover, it is only under conditions of complete economic and social emancipation that these values will be developed in every way and become the principal moral guidelines in the process of building communism.

Concern for woman is the main condition for the development and strengthening of the socialist family. Socialism alone has created for the first time ever conditions for the complete economic and social emancipation of woman and for the achievement of complete equality of women and men in society. This is "ensured by according women equal access with men to education and vocational and professional training, equal opportunities in employment, remuneration, and promotion , and in social and political, and cultural activity, and by special labour and health protection measures for women; by providing conditions enabling mothers to work; by legal protection, and material and moral support for mothers and children, including paid leaves and other benefits for expectant mothers and mothers, and gradual reduction of working time for mothers with small children."¹

The Communists' attitude to the so-called women's question has always been determined by the fact that the working class cannot achieve complete freedom without winning completely freedom for women, while women for their part cannot rid themselves of enslavement and discrimination without socialist revolution. It is in recognition of the need for unity between the women's and the proletarian movement for emancipation that lies the main difference between the Marxist-Leninist solution of this question and its bourgeois-democratic interpretation.

An important aspect of the social policy of the socialist state in marital and family relations lies in the progressive relieving of the family of some of its traditional functions. "The state helps the family by providing and developing a broad system of childcare institutions, by organizing and improving communal services and public catering, by paying grants on the birth of a child, by providing children's allowances and benefits for large families, and other forms of family allowances and assistance."² But does not this process mean "dissolution" of the family in the socialist

1. Constitution (Fundamental Law) of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Art. 35.

2. Ibid., Art. 53.

requisite leading to the anti-humanistic interpretation of Marxism. It is either science or humanism, and the possibility of the existence of scientific humanism is believed an absurdity. This is manifest in the ideas of the French "Marxist" Louis Althusser. He says that Marx remained loyal to the principles of humanism only so long as his theory had not become scientific (he gives 1845 and the "Theses on Feuerbach" as the "upper" boundary of Marx's humanism) and states that in his mature works Marx adopted the stand of "theoretical anti-humanism". According to Althusser, humanism was the price Marx paid for the scientific character of his views. "From the point of view of rigid theory, it is possible and therefore necessary to discuss openly the theoretical anti-humanism of Marx We can learn anything about people only on the condition that the philosophical (theoretical) myth about man is dispelled. Any way of thinking laying claim to being restored in one form or another, either as an anthropology or as theoretical humanism, is according to Marx nothing short of ashes from the point of view of theory."¹

This is how science and humanism are turned against each other. Although Althusser recognises the humanistic character of Marxism in ideology,² his admission only shows that the gap between humanism and science is compounded in his way of thinking by a gap between science and ideology, between theory and practice, which is the direct opposite of revolutionary Marxism.

That is why the question asked by A. Lefevres in his Dialectical Materialism is intrinsically fallacious: "What is Marxism?... Is it ideology (the ideology of the proletariat) or science?" The strength of the ideological impact of Marxism relies on its scientific character and at the same time Marx-

1. Louis Althusser, Pour art, Maspero, Paris, 1965, p. 236.

2. "Marx's theoretical anti-humanism in no way removes the historical existence of humanism... . His theoretical anti-humanism recognises the need for humanism as an ideology." (*Ibid.*, p. 237).

emancipation has been viciously attacked since its very inception and attempts have been made to distort its meaning. One of the more popular misinterpretations is to impute anti-humanistic meanings to this theory. Presumably, the human individual finds himself entirely "dissolved" in faceless social structures: society is everything, while man is nothing. In so-doing, such "interpreters" set the humanism of the philosophical views of the "young Marx" in opposition to the scientism¹ of the "mature Marx", who in his latter-day works presented historical processes as "mechanistic" and took the position of "theoretical anti-humanism". What can be said about this view?

To begin with, this misrepresentation of Marxism is not original. Way back Bernstein, Kautsky and other representatives of what was known as "economic materialism" believed that Marx was not at all interested in the problems of the spiritual life of society and human existence. They viewed the heightened interest of the classics of Marxism in the problems of social being as the total lack of any interest in the problems of social consciousness. According to "economic materialism", all the specific originality of cultural and historical process, including "the world of man", can be derived directly and immediately from the economics. Marx once remarked with bitter irony to Lafargue in connection with this interpretation of his doctrine by French proponents of "economic materialism" who called themselves "Marxists": "All I know is that I am not a Marxist".² Relapses of "economic materialism", occur even today in the form of different right-wing revisionist conceptions and bourgeois technicist theories.

It is an abstract understanding of humanism, which is set in opposition to science, that is a methodological pre-
 1. Scientism (from the Latin "scientia", knowledge, science) holds that science and its principles are all-important in the world outlook.

2. Marx, Engels, Selected Correspondence, p. 393.

This shows that Marxism does not at all reject human individuality but, conversely, imparts concrete social content to its essence. That is why the way actually to change concrete human individuals is to change in practice concrete social relations. The actual humanisation of relations between people is the humanisation of actual, real relations between people. Only that humanism is real which incorporates a scholarly substantiation of the possibility of it being implemented in practice and points revolutionary means for doing so. It is this kind of humanism that is represented by Marxism that enables a concrete human individual to live the full-blooded life of the human being, that is, to become really free only through cognising the essential laws of social development and the revolutionary movement in harmony with those laws.

The Marxist understanding of the social ideal is related not only to the formulation of a scientific theory of its realisation but also to the revolutionary activity of the mass of the people to translate this ideal into practice. Marxism recognises only one way of attaining this ideal — revolutionary practice. It is revolutionary practice alone that represents for man the conditions under which change in his circumstances coincides with the establishment of real humanism in the process of human activity. "The coincidence of the changing of circumstances and of human activity or self-change can be conceived and rationally understood only as revolutionary practice."¹ Revolutionary practice is the supreme form of the manifestation of true humanism: "...The class overthrowing it /the ruling class/ can only in a revolution succeed in ridding itself of all the muck of ages and become fitted to found society anew."²

The understanding of Marxism as scientific humanism from the point of view of theory, therefore, leads to the recognition of its revolutionary character in social practice. Marxism is not only a means of explaining the world but also an

1. K. Marx, F. Engels, Collected Works, Vol. 5, p. 4.

2. Ibid., p. 53.

ism can only be a science by being the ideology of the most advanced class of our day, the working class, which has an interest in cognising the objective law-governed processes of social development.

The anti-human interpretation of Marxism provokes numerous attempts to "correct" it. This is the "logic" of any form of revisionism. It incorporates two positions. At first Marxism is interpreted as being deficient in one respect or another and then components of doctrines which are alien to Marxism are added to it under the plausible pretext of making up for those deficiencies. That is how "parodies of Marxism" come into being and how revisionism links up with bourgeois doctrines seeking to "humanise" Marxism. But does Marxism need this "humanising"?

The fact is that the Marxist theory of man and his social nature does not at all mean disregard for the living human individual. The human nature is the "ensemble" of those social relations into which man enters as he comes into this world and which he is creating in his activity. Human existence is the reproduction of that social essence in an individualised form. That is why the Marxist analysis of the human nature always results in the examination of the individual forms of its manifestation, an analysis of specific individuals in specific situations. The ultimate meaning and purpose of this analysis is the revolutionary transformation of these "situations" and the filling of them with humanistic content. "We have, in conclusion," Marx wrote, "the class struggle into which the movement and the analysis of the whole business resolves itself..."¹ Thus, the sixth thesis of Marx's on Feuerbach (Man's essence is "the ensemble of the social relations") is connected with his famous eleventh thesis ("The philosophers have only interpreted the world in various ways; the point is to change it").²

1. Marx, Engels, Selected Correspondence, p. 195.

2. K. Marx, F. Engels, Collected Works, Vol. 5, pp. 4,5.

Chapter IV

THE POLITICAL SYSTEM OF SOCIETY

Analysis of the political system and its centralised institution, the state, is very important for understanding the dynamics of social development. The theory of the state and the political system of society as a whole holds pride of place in Marxism-Leninism. This is due to the fact that from the outset the state and the political system as a whole play an active role in the life of society and in the regulation of social relations. Small wonder this issue is the subject of keen ideological struggle between the Communists and the proponents of bourgeois democracy.

What is the genesis and nature of the state? What are the characteristic features of the bourgeois political system and tendencies of its development? What are the nature and specific features of the state in the developing countries? What can be said about the state-political system of a new, socialist type?

1. Genesis and Nature of the State and the Political System of Society as a Whole

Concept of the Political Organisation and Political System of Society

The realm of politics includes relations between classes, nations and all people with regard to power, the state, etc.

Marx, Engels and Lenin always attached much importance to politics in their theoretical writings and practical work to mobilise the revolutionary forces to win power and effect deep-going social transformations. The attempts by bourgeois political scientists to pass themselves off as pioneers in political theory and to prove that scientific research into the problems of politics has no lasting tradition in Marxism-Leninism are not at all corroborated by real facts.

Throughout their activity Marx and Engels attached much attention to research into the nature of politics, political power and the political system of society, formulating and

effective tool of remaking it. It enables man both to explain the existing organisation of the world and also to re-organise it in accordance with his own interests. "Marxism differs from all other socialist theories in the remarkable way it combines complete scientific sobriety in the analysis of the objective state of affairs and the objective course of evolution with the most emphatic recognition of the importance of the revolutionary energy, revolutionary creative genius, and revolutionary initiative of the masses - and also, of course, of individuals, groups, organisations, and parties that are able to discover and achieve contact with one or another class."¹ The unbreakable unity of humanism, science-based approach and revolutionary action embodied in Marxism makes it "a guide for action" in the assertion of real humanism, namely, communism.

1. V.I. Lenin, Collected Works, Vol. 13, p. 36.

cal system is a totality of the institutions of society and its communications through which political power is exercised, and includes all the political organisations of society and all the forms of the citizens' direct participation in politics.

What is meant by political power, the core of which is state power, is the actual capability of a given class or another social group, or an individual, to exercise its will in society in the form of political decisions and legal rules; it likewise denotes a certain organisation (the state, party, army, etc.) and practical activities in pursuit of the goals and tasks of that organisation.

In other words, the political system incorporates the entire gamut of the political life of society, is correlated with the economic and social systems and is likewise rooted in class relations.

The conception of the political system was a logical sequel to the systems approach to the state, replaced the narrow understanding of the state as a state machinery, and reflected the idea of the state as "a political system of society" (Karl Marx). This approach is fully in accord with Lenin's view that politics is "the sphere of relationships of all classes and strata to the state and the government, the sphere of the interrelations between all classes."¹

Analysing the composition of the basic elements of the political system of society, we can identify at least four groups:

1. political structure (political organisations);
2. political and legal rules;
3. political relations;
4. political consciousness and political culture.

These four groups of components embrace the entire political system of society as "the official expression of civil society" (Karl Marx) and characterise different aspects of its political activity. The political system of society inclu-

1. V.I. Lenin, Collected Works, Vol. 5, p. 422.

translating into practice the demands of proletarian politics as opposed to the policies pursued by the ruling classes. They formulated the general theoretical and methodological principles of the science of politics and, moreover, supplied remarkable examples of specific analysis of the political process, the functioning of the state, political parties, individual leaders, etc. Such works by Marx and Engels as The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte, The Class Struggles in France are good examples of this analysis.

Lenin viewed the theoretical analysis of imperialist politics as a major task. In his works we come across all the basic ideas on the dialectical method and sociological analysis of political phenomena, including definitions of the nature of the state and other elements of the political system, and the principles of relations between states on the world scene. Lenin closely scrutinised all the aspects of the political process, thoroughly and painstakingly analysed the nature of the institutions of power and administration, the structure and activities of parties and trade unions, the political struggle of classes and individual groups, the political behaviour of the mass of the people, their leaders and other politicians, and social psychology. Being the leader of the party and the state, he laid the foundations of the theory of administration, which is a major component of the science of politics.

These traditions are now being translated into practice by the communist and workers' parties, which work out practical policies, supply answers to political problems at their congresses, and also advance the political theory.

What is the political organisation of society?

The political organisation of society is a totality of institutions which are the tools of the formulation and implementation of policies, first and foremost the state, law and political parties, and also mass organisations and associations of citizens regulating political relations in society.

The concept of the political organisation of society is closely linked with the concept of the political system. The political system of society is a broad concept characterising all the aspects of the political life of society. The politi-

religious orders, guilds and estate and occupational associations and organisations had a great role to play in political life. Under capitalism, the state plays the dominant role in the life of society. The importance of political parties grows as well. As the proletariat becomes "a class for itself" rather than "a class in itself", the role of workers' organisations in the political system of society increases substantially. The political system of socialist society differs fundamentally from those mentioned above. Its mechanism and principles of functioning provide for the maximum possible participation of the mass of the working people (all citizens in advanced socialist society) in politics and all the other areas of national life.

The state plays the decisive role in the political system of society. Unlike any other organisation or institution, it has the right and capability to make all members of society abide by the rules laid down by it. Bourgeois ideologists, trying to camouflage the true nature of the state, often identify it with power in general. There is no need to argue that power is an intrinsic attribute of human society (in the past, at present and in the future).

The nature of the state should be considered not in the context of power in general but in the context of the emergence of private property, exploitation of man by man and the division of society into antagonistic classes. It is these factors that gave rise to the state and political relations.

In primitive society - due to its economic system - there was no state nor any need for them. A certain machinery for the administration of community affairs, known in history as clan and tribal organisation, corresponded to the economic basis of that system. There was no law under conditions of primitive society either. Human behaviour was regulated by rules of morality, most of which existed in the form of customs, expressed the interests of all members of society and were observed by them according to tradition and out of habit.

The development of the productive forces led to the replacement of primitive-communal relations of production with

des, first and foremost, the structure of governmental and other political organisations, the forms of participation of the mass of the people in administration and political control, the mechanism of the participation of the citizenry in politics, etc. Political and legal rules determine in a formalised manner the character of political relations in society.

An analysis of the role of law as a social institution, its relationship with politics, the correlation of legal norms and the actual status of the individual, national and international legislation on human rights, etc., plays a very important role. Political relations reflect the actual participation of all the social groups and individuals in the political process. Political consciousness is also a characteristic of all the participants in political relationships.

There are basic differences between the political systems of socialist, capitalist and developing countries not only from the point of view of their class character but also from the point of view of the mechanism of functioning of their political systems. An analysis of the political system of bourgeois society makes it possible, on the one hand, to show the actual mechanism of the political dominance of monopolies and, on the other, to demonstrate the role played by progressive movements, first and foremost the working class, in the struggle for democracy and for curbing the monopolies' sway. It is a major task for political scientists to characterise the types of present-day political systems, political regimes, political cultures and political movements.

The Genesis of the State and Law

The state is a central institution of the political system of society.

The history of social development shows that every socio-economic formation has its own historical type of the state and the political system of society as a whole. In slave-owning societies, for instance, a great role was played in politics, in addition to the state, by institutions representing social estates and their institutions, secret societies and religious organisations. The role of the state and particularly of the church grew in feudal society. Religious ideology expressed, as a rule, the political aspirations of different classes and social strata. Knights' and

in the form of law-making. This was how the close relationship of the state and law manifested itself.

Nature of the State

In characterising the nature of the state and its role in exploitative society,

Engels wrote that "it is, as a rule, the state of the most powerful, economically dominant class, which, through the medium of the state, becomes also the politically dominant class, and thus acquires new means of holding down and exploiting the oppressed class" (underlined by the editor).¹

What is the role of the state in a society divided into antagonistic classes? The main purpose of the state and law as the most important elements of the superstructure is to protect and strengthen their economic basis and to uphold the interests of the economically dominant class.

Having emerged on the basis of a definite economic system of society and serving that system by contributing to its consolidation and preserving it, the state at the same time is acquiring relative independence from its economic basis.

The state not only protects the interests of the dominant class but also regulates relations within that class. Sometimes, to protect the common interests of the dominant class, which it serves, the state may limit to a certain degree the arbitrariness of its individual representatives or groups. Moreover, the resolute struggle of the mass of the population forces the exploiter states to take isolated measures to protect the interests of working people.

The relative independence of the state as a component of the superstructure is manifest in the fact that, in addition to protecting the interests of the dominant class, it regulates the life of society as an integral organism and manages its affairs. However, the relative independence of the exploiter state and its law from the economic basis does not mean that they are above classes. When all is said and done, they always serve the cause of maintaining the stabi-

1. K. Marx and F. Engels, Selected Works in three volumes,
Vol. 3, p. 328.

those of slave ownership, rooted in private property. There emerged exploitation of man by man and society became divided into antagonistic classes. The clan and tribal organisation proved unable to reconcile their contradictions. That was why the state and law emerged in its place. The clan system, Engels wrote, was exploded "by the division of society into classes. Its place was taken by the state."¹ Law is the will of the ruling class expressed in legislative form. It emerged along with the state and due to the same causes.

The emergence of the state and law was a long process, characterised by different features under various historical circumstances. They were determined by economic and social causes and also by the historical setting in which different peoples developed.

What are the distinctive features of the state as compared with the clan and tribal organisation of society?

Engels identified two of them, first, the division of the population according to the territorial characteristic rather than blood and tribal relationships, and, second, the existence of public power. Public power does not coincide with but, conversely, rises over the population and is not the power of the public but a power exercised by special groups of people in the interests of the economically dominant class. This power, Engels stressed, not only consists of armed men but also has such material adjuncts as prisons and institutions of coercion of all kinds which were unknown in class society.²

Along with the above characteristics, the state, unlike the clan and tribal organisation, levies taxes on people to maintain its machinery.

The emergence of the state was accompanied by the formation of law. Unlike the precepts of morality in primitive society, norms of a legal nature were established by the state and punishment was imposed for violating them. The observance of these norms was guaranteed by the coercive strength of the state, which in turn formalised its activity

1. K. Marx and F. Engels, Selected Works in three volumes, Vol. 3, p. 326.

2. Ibid., p. 327.

of the economic basis with regard to the superstructure demonstrate the causes of the existence of states and the replacement of one type of state by another.

The economic basis of a social formation with a mode of production based on private property gives rise to antagonistic classes and the economically dominant class ensures its power through the state. In this way, every antagonistic socio-economic formation is characterised by only one type of state, which is replaced as one formation gives way to another.

The practice of world development has seen three successive types of state with antagonistic classes, the slave-owning, the feudal and the bourgeois state.

In addition to the basic historical types of the state, social development knows of secondary types, which emerged as the old economic basis was replaced by a new one. The states of this type have been characteristic of the entire history of human society. In the past, they emerged when slave-owning society was being replaced by feudalism or when a democratic revolution was growing into a socialist revolution. The state in some developing countries is transitory in nature.

Every type of state functions in certain forms. The form of the state is understood to include its internal structure, organisation and the way in which state power is exercised. It incorporates the form of government, the state structure and the political regime. States are divided by the form of government into monarchies (from the Greek monarkhia, one-man rule), such as Britain, Nepal and Norway, and republics (from the Latin res, a thing, matter, affair, and publicus, public, of the whole people), such as India, Peru and Italy. Depending on their organisation, states are divided into federal or union, e.g., Yugoslavia and Mexico, and unitary, such as Syria and France. Federal states consist of member states, each having supreme bodies of power and administration, and also a judicial system.¹ In unitary states power is organised in accordance with administrative-territorial divisions

¹. The federation should not be mixed up with the confederation, which is an alliance of states formed for definite military, economic, and other purposes.

ty of the existing system and the power of the dominant classes.

The nature of any state and the contents of its activity are manifest in the functions performed by it. The functions of the state are the basic areas of its activity in which the class nature of the state, its social purpose and its role in the life of society at different stages of the latter's development manifest themselves.

The functions of any state can be divided into internal and external. The aim of the internal functions is to ensure the security of the existing system and the hegemony of the dominant classes, and also to regulate the life of society as a whole.

The external functions consist in protecting the state, its prestige and influence on the international scene, upholding its relations with other states, defending states with a similar class essence or close in spirit and, in the case of state divided into antagonistic classes, in territorial expansion at the expense of other countries.

The functions performed by the state are divided into basic and secondary. The former are a direct manifestation of the class nature of the state, e.g., the suppression of the working people in exploitative society. Some functions of the latter group help to perform effectively the functions of the former, e.g., the economic function of the bourgeois state. By carrying out a number of secondary functions, the state regulates the life of society as an integral entity. One example is the function of suppressing crime (thievery, hooliganism, swindling). Ultimately, all the secondary functions are subordinate to the effective performance of the basic ones.

Historical Types and Forms of the State

existence and its class nature, i.e., its type. Every socio-economic formation is characterised by a certain type of state. The law of interaction between relations of production and the productive forces and the law of the determining role

To understand the nature of the state, it is important to know the concrete historical circumstances of its

Last but not least, the form of the state is determined to a certain extent by the historical traditions of a given country, by the specific characteristics and political culture of a given people, and also by other factors. For instance, the establishment of the fascist regime in Germany in 1933 was caused for the most part by the specific features of class struggle and by the economic and socio-political crisis in the country. The elimination of fascism and the fall of the monarchy in Italy can be explained not only by the changed lineup of class forces but also by the international situation. The preservation of monarchy in Britain, in particular, is attributable to the country's historical traditions.

It follows that many factors, in addition to the economic system, influence the form of the state and account for changes in it. It is only a dialectico-materialist analysis of all the factors with due regard for the political practice of a given country that can explain why precisely this form of the state has been established in it. At the same time all the factors determining the form of the state, including the economic system of society, are subject to the influence of the state. The character and extent of this influence depend to a considerable degree on its form.

2. The Political System of Bourgeois Society Today

Nature and Forms of the Bourgeois State

The bourgeois state emerged as a result of the victory of the bourgeois revolution,

which crowned the establishment of a new economic system in society with the assertion of an appropriate political and legal superstructure. The bourgeois state is "a grandiose institution for the exploitation of the huge majority of the people by a small, ever-diminishing minority".¹

The victory of capitalism over feudalism and the assertion of bourgeois statehood was historically progressive. The bourgeois system freed the exploited from personal legal

1. K. Marx and F. Engels, Selected Works in one volume, p. 374.

following the "centre-provinces" pattern.

The state can assume different forms within the framework of the same historical type. For instance, there were slave-owning monarchies and republics. At the same time similar forms are found in different historical types of the state. For instance, both slave-owning and feudal states functioned as monarchies and republics. Both these forms characterise the bourgeois state as well. This does not indicate, however, that the nature of power and its form are totally divorced. Feudal states for the most part were monarchies, while the republican form of government is more characteristic of bourgeois states.

The political regime characterises the political system of a society from the point of view of its functioning. The political regime is a totality of the methods and techniques used by the dominant class to exercise its rule in society. The basic political regimes in present-day bourgeois states include the parliamentary, the authoritarian, the military-dictatorial and the fascist regimes.

The dominant class in a society divided into antagonistic classes can exercise its power by liberal methods, acting on behalf of the people. This political regime is referred to as parliamentary democracy (from the Greek demos, people, and kratia, power).

Another kind of political regime in antagonistic society is the overt dictatorship of the dominant class based on direct violence. During the slave-owning and feudal periods the political regimes of this kind were known as autocratic (from the Greek autokratia, one-man-rule). Nowadays they are referred to as fascist, authoritarian or totalitarian (from the Latin totalis, whole, entire, complete), meaning total state control through overt violence.

What determines the form of a state, its political regime and what factors contribute to their change? The economic system, having a decisive impact on the type of the state, influences changes in the form of the state not directly but in a mediated way, through the alignment of forces of the antagonistic classes. A considerable influence is exerted on the development of the form of the state by the international situation in which a given state is emerging and developing.

causes particularly strike the eye in the field of foreign policy, as exemplified by the enormous expansion of the international activities and the escalation of imperialist activities of the United States. This phenomenon is explained mostly by political and ideological reasons. The role in which the leaders of that country have cast themselves stems directly from the desire of the US bourgeoisie to hold back the historical process and to raise obstacles in the way of the advancing national liberation movement. The US foreign-policy activities intended to accomplish these tasks have become all but the main preoccupation of the White House. All this accounts for the militarisation of the US economy, the unheard of growth of military production, the swelling of the armed forces and the extension of diplomatic, intelligence and ideological activities in other countries. It is in no other area that the social nature of the bourgeois state is so visible as it is in its relationships with other countries, particularly with the socialist states and the developing nations upholding their independence in struggle against imperialism.

We can identify the following functions of the present-day bourgeois state, bearing in mind the direction in which it is developing:

1. Protection of the capitalist mode of production and capitalist property, of the entire socio-political structure, and law and order established in the bourgeois state.
2. Regulation of the economy and assistance to the development of the productive forces in the interest of monopoly capital.
3. Regulation of social relations between the capitalists and the workers by the extension of social legislation, by arbitration and by other measures taken with a view to mitigating antagonisms between the classes and modernising social structures for the benefit of the capitalist system as a whole.
4. Cultural, educational and ideological influence on the mass media, including the press, radio and television, and on cultural and educational agencies in order to socialise the individual and to educate the entire population in a

dependence. The bourgeois state, however, failed to abolish the exploitation of man by man and retained its basis, the private ownership of the means of production.

As it developed, the bourgeois state passed through the period of pre-monopoly capitalism and the period of imperialism. The nature of that state practically has not changed, while the contents and methods of its functioning have been altered to a considerable degree. While during the rise of capitalism the state, as Marx aptly put it, was "the night watchman" of capitalism, today it has become the "conductor" managing the affairs of the ruling group, monopoly capital. The growing role of the state in regulating every aspect of the life of society is due to the crisis of capitalism and to the need to use state power more extensively to guard the outdated relations of production. The bourgeois state "resorts ever more extensively to such instruments as state-stimulated monopolistic concentration of production and capital, redistribution by the state of an increasing proportion of the national income, allocation of war contracts to the monopolies, government financing of industrial development and research programmes, the drawing up of economic development programmes on a country-wide scale, the policy of imperialist integration and new forms of capital export."¹

The changes in the character of functioning of the bourgeois state have found their reflection in the extension of the traditional and the emergence of new functions.²

The extension of the tasks and functions of the present-day capitalist state is called for not only by objective factors, such as the growth of productive forces, the complexification of social life as a whole and the rise of state-monopoly capitalism; it is also generated by the causes which are intrinsic to the very nature of this type of state. These

1. International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties, Moscow, 1969, Peace and Socialism Publishers, Prague, 1969, p. 18.
2. By the function we understand the description of the properties of the state that are manifest in a definite kind of its activities.

Mechanism and Legal System of the Bourgeois State

The mechanism of the bourgeois state incorporates representative bodies, bodies of administration and the judicial system. The army, police, intelligence and counter-intelligence are playing a major role in the mechanism of power. They are the immediate tools of the class dominance of the exploiters and occupy positions of privilege in the state machinery. In some countries huge powers have been vested in them, enabling them to meddle with impunity in every aspect of the activities of the state (e.g., the CIA and the FBI in the United States).

The parliament has a special role to play among the institutions of the bourgeois state. It is used to make the will of the dominant class seem "the will of the people". The parliament is rendered obedient to monopoly capital in many ways worked out by the bourgeoisie as it has been trying to gain control of the growing political activity of the working people.

Parliaments play different roles in the mechanism of various bourgeois states, with the overall tendency being the lessening of their importance. When monopoly capital wishes, it can use the parliament to "bridle" the executive branch.

Bourgeois ideologists are trying to explain away the declining role of parliaments in capitalist states by the fact that in the past only a "qualified minority" was taking part in their work, whereas today, with universal suffrage introduced, it is becoming more and more difficult to keep up "the quality of representation". The arguments of bourgeois ideologists show that nowadays the ruling classes in capitalist countries do not trust parliaments because, despite all their efforts, the role of the working people in the representative bodies is growing.

The communist and workers' parties in capitalist countries make use of parliaments on a large scale to protect the interests of the working people and to expose the undemocratic policies of bourgeois governments.

"The way out of parliamentarism," Lenin wrote, "is

spirit of bourgeois ideology and culture.

5. Foreign policy, the primary aim of which is to protect the economic and political interests of a given bourgeois state on the international scene, and to struggle by ideological, political, economic and military methods against communism and the working-class and national liberation movements all over the world.

Some scholars identify the suppression and exploitation of the mass of the working people as a function of the bourgeois state on a par with all the other functions performed by it. This approach, however, is open to criticism. It is not a function but the nature of any bourgeois state to keep the working people within the existing mode of production and to exploit and suppress them. All the functions of the bourgeois state are related in one way or another to the accomplishment of that major task, and to reduce it to one function, performed along with other state activities, means inadvertently to contribute to the propagation of the illusion that the bourgeois state devotes a vast portion of its activities to work which benefits society as a whole and to lose sight of the fact that in reality even those activities in which society has an interest, such as maintenance of law and order, protection of citizens against crime and the development of public education and culture, also are subject to the crippling influence of the exploitative nature of the bourgeois state.

It is a different matter, of course, that the task of suppressing the mass of the working people is performed by various parts of the machinery of the bourgeois state in different ways, directly and openly by some and indirectly by others. Such organs of the state as secret and regular police, the army, the courts and the procuracy are the immediate tools of class suppression, whereas educational institutions and research centres, while carrying out the task of raising the educational and cultural standards (thus benefiting society as a whole, including the working people), are fostering mass culture which by and large helps to preserve the capitalist structure.

economic integration has given rise to inter-state agencies. The army and police machinery has reached unheard-of dimensions.

The expansion of the administrative functions of the bourgeois state has brought about considerably more extensive specialisation and professionalism of its machinery,¹ and as a consequence its further bureaucratisation and the spread of corruption. One result of changes in government is the further exacerbation of antagonisms between the state, on the one hand, and the mass of the population, on the other.

The vast expansion of the functions of the bourgeois state today has resulted in the unprecedented swelling of bureaucracy, which has become a huge machinery with its own hierarchic structure, a special code of behaviour, discipline and privileges. Can we say that the vast machinery of the bourgeois state is relatively independent not only from society as a whole but also from the ruling classes to which it ultimately owes its allegiance? This problem requires special examination. It is beyond doubt, on the one hand, that the multi-million state machinery, inflated to unbelievable proportions and isolated from society by a system of rules, regulations and prejudices (and, moreover, reflecting, in addition to everything else, a certain specialisation in society), cannot but help developing a tendency for independence.

This tendency manifests itself in the steady and, in a sense, irrational swelling of state machinery, and also in the procedures of policy formulation and decision-making, which have become extremely more complex.

There also are other factors which make dependence between the ruling class and the state machinery mediated and reciprocal. These include, in particular, the rise of state-monopoly and state capitalism with the resultant huge expansion of the economic function of the state; pressure exerted

not, of course, the abolition of representative institutions and the elective principle, but the conversion of the representative institutions from talking shops into 'working' bodies."¹

The bourgeois state operates by issuing legal acts, with bills passed by parliaments and intended to regulate major aspects of the life of the state playing a special role. However, the bourgeoisie resorts more and more often to the breakdown of legality, the law and order for the establishment of which it once fought. Extra-judicial repression, pogroms, acts of violence and political assassinations are common practices in a number of countries. Another manifestation of this tendency is the fact that executive bodies have begun to issue legislative acts quite frequently. Lastly, the practice of "emergency legislation" has become widespread in capitalist countries, enabling their governments to exercise unlimited powers and to suspend not only conventional laws but even the constitution.

As a result of the extended functions of the bourgeois state under conditions of state-monopoly capitalism and the scientific and technological revolution, its administrative activities have been changed considerably nowadays. The bodies of government energetically intervene in relations between individual groups of monopoly capital, participate in drawing up, coordinating and financing economic development and research programmes, and actively contribute to the execution of technical policies and to planning personnel training.

As rivalry between monopolies has grown more acute, the changed role of the bodies of government in bourgeois countries benefits the ruling classes because it helps the outdated machinery of capitalist self-regulation to continue in existence.

As the administrative powers of the bourgeois states expand, there have of late emerged economic management and planning bodies, scientific, propaganda and information centres, and agencies supervising mass media. Capitalist

1. V.I. Lenin, Collective Works, Vol. 25, p. 423.

the whole, bourgeois governments, particularly in favourable economic conditions created by the introduction of scientific and technical achievements, part with a modicum of the capitalists' profits. Of course, the state bureaucracy, who do not lose anything personally, are more willing to accept this imperative, painful to the capitalists, than the capitalists themselves.

This does not at all show, however, that bureaucracy is becoming an intermediate force in bourgeois society. To become such, it should have been ready not only to uphold the existing forms of property and the socio-political structures as a whole but also to go over to socialised forms of property, to the socialist system. But even the formulation of this problem with regard to imperialist states sounds a mere nonsense.

The bourgeois states are ruled by the capitalist class, primarily by monopolies. But as has been noted above, the economy, culture, police, army, foreign-policy agencies, etc. are supervised, as a rule, by career politicians trained and promoted through political parties, the officialdom, etc. Most of them come from the middle strata of the population.

A differentiated analysis of state bureaucracy shows that management of the economy, health care, education and culture, substantially differing from supervision of the repressive agencies, such as the army, police and intelligence service, is playing a great role in present-day imperialist states. This fact demands a differentiated approach to the problem of influencing the state machinery and to the struggle for its democratisation.

Lastly, much importance is attached to ways and methods by which the mass of the working people and their vanguard, the working class and the communist parties, can influence the activity of the state machinery and the political system as a whole. The struggle waged by communist parties in parliaments and out of them, the establishment of different mass organisations and pressure groups, vigorous influence exerted through the communist and democratic press, radio and television, strikes, rallies, demonstrations and infiltration of the state machinery and the army are among the methods the

on the state by the class forces opposed to and combatting the monopolies; the complication of all the functions involved in running society with its well-developed economy and mass actions during social conflicts; and lastly, the great influence of international factors, first and foremost, the changed alignment of world forces in favour of socialism, democracy and peace. As a result of all this, the state machinery, remaining a guardian of the capitalist system, is gaining more relative independence, in particular, from the dominant class. This independence could be defined rather as greater freedom of action in protecting the political and social structures as a whole.

The basic interests of the privileged employees of the state machinery do not go beyond the framework of the interests of the dominant classes. The officialdom, who depend for their continued existence on the preservation of the system based on private property, are naturally called upon to serve that system. At the same time they have their own specific interests, which may differ from the interests of one part of the bourgeoisie or another, or one group of monopoly capital or another. For instance, the industrial officialdom working at state-owned enterprises have an interest in the expansion of those industries and the public sector as a whole. This ambition may run afoul of the interests of individual monopoly amalgamations and provoke a conflict with them. But when it comes to protecting the ruling class as a whole against the encroachments of the working people, the state bureaucracy and monopoly capital always put up a single front. Social legislation exemplifies this relative independence of the bourgeois state. Concessions won in this field by the mass of the working people from the bourgeois state in protracted and hard-fought struggle are often to the prejudice of monopolies, which have to assume certain commitments towards workers. These facts only show, however, that bourgeois governments, frightened by the upsurge of the working-class and liberation movements, are more far-sighted than individual capitalists and protect the interests of the ruling class as a whole. Wishing to preserve

the whole, bourgeois governments, particularly in favourable economic conditions created by the introduction of scientific and technical achievements, part with a modicum of the capitalists' profits. Of course, the state bureaucracy, who do not lose anything personally, are more willing to accept this imperative, painful to the capitalists, than the capitalists themselves.

This does not at all show, however, that bureaucracy is becoming an intermediate force in bourgeois society. To become such, it should have been ready not only to uphold the existing forms of property and the socio-political structures as a whole but also to go over to socialised forms of property, to the socialist system. But even the formulation of this problem with regard to imperialist states sounds a mere nonsense.

The bourgeois states are ruled by the capitalist class, primarily by monopolies. But as has been noted above, the economy, culture, police, army, foreign-policy agencies, etc. are supervised, as a rule, by career politicians trained and promoted through political parties, the officialdom, etc. Most of them come from the middle strata of the population.

A differentiated analysis of state bureaucracy shows that management of the economy, health care, education and culture, substantially differing from supervision of the repressive agencies, such as the army, police and intelligence service, is playing a great role in present-day imperialist states. This fact demands a differentiated approach to the problem of influencing the state machinery and to the struggle for its democratisation.

Lastly, much importance is attached to ways and methods by which the mass of the working people and their vanguard, the working class and the communist parties, can influence the activity of the state machinery and the political system as a whole. The struggle waged by communist parties in parliaments and out of them, the establishment of different mass organisations and pressure groups, vigorous influence exerted through the communist and democratic press, radio and television, strikes, rallies, demonstrations and infiltration of the state machinery and the army are among the methods the

study of which represents much interest from the point of view of both theory and practice.

Critical or opposition-minded public opinion can have substantial influence on politics in bourgeois countries. The communist press has been legalised in the overwhelming majority of Western states.

In addition, the press expressing the interests of the democratic forces is relatively widespread. Although the press, radio and television serving the ruling classes are dominant in all the bourgeois countries, the actual influence of the opposition press on politics in those countries is more considerable than it could have been on the strength of its comparative size alone. Influence on public opinion is one of the major means by which communist parties in the capitalist world can contribute to the creation of conditions for democratic reforms.

Crisis of Bourgeois Democracy

From the outset bourgeois democracy constituted a covert, camouflaged form of the exercise of power by the class of capitalists. But the bourgeoisie is the absolute minority of the population and for this reason democracy in bourgeois society can never be the genuine rule of the people. To begin with, it is restricted to politics, whereas production management is unconditionally dominated by the class of proprietors and by technocrats faithfully serving their masters.

One characteristic feature of bourgeois democracy is its formal nature. The actual status of man in society depends on his belonging to a particular class, on his wealth. In addition, the rights and freedoms of citizens, formal as they are, are usually restricted in many ways.

Bourgeois democracy depends on the passive role of the mass of the population in politics. This characteristic feature of bourgeois democracy is recognised even by bourgeois ideologists. For instance, the well-known British political scientist George Parry has had to admit the need for a certain extension of the people's participation in politics.¹

¹. G. Parry, Participation in Politics. Manchester University Press, Totowa (N.Y.), Rowman & Littlefield, 1972.

Certain bourgeois ideologists, aware that today it is impossible to keep people out of politics, often discuss the long-overdue need for change in the quality of life, meaning, in addition to everything else, a certain participation of the working people in government. By formulating this idea, they, naturally, pursue the sole objective of enhancing the viability of the capitalist system.

The transition of capitalist society to imperialism in the course of its development is characterised by a turn from democracy to reaction. "Both in foreign and home policy imperialism strives towards violations of democracy, towards reaction. In this sense imperialism is indisputably the 'negation' of democracy in general, of all democracy..."¹ This is due to the fact that imperialism has replaced free enterprise with the unchallenged rule of monopoly capital in the economy and therefore in politics.

The progress made by the proletariat in class struggle, the disillusionment of the mass of the working people, including progressive intellectuals, with capitalism, the growing political awareness and political culture of the working people and some other factors imposed constraints on the once unchallenged supremacy of monopoly capital under conditions of bourgeois democracy. Lenin supplied a brilliant example of the application of dialectics to the problem of attitude to democracy. "... Socialism," he wrote, "is impossible without democracy because: (1) the proletariat cannot perform the socialist revolution unless it prepares for it by the struggle for democracy; (2) victorious socialism cannot consolidate its victory and bring humanity to the withering away of the state without implementing full democracy."²

The Communists identify in capitalist democracy, on the one hand, forms and methods meeting the needs of the political dominance of the bourgeoisie and, on the other, the rights and freedoms won by the working people in persevering struggle.

1. V.I. Lenin, Collected Works, Vol. 23, p. 43.

2. Ibid., p. 74.

waged over many years. The latter rights include the freedom of the press, of assembly, of demonstrations, the right to strike, to establish political and professional organisations, and certain concessions in social relations wrenched from the bourgeoisie and formalised in legislation. These rights and freedoms -- curtailed and often formal -- are not at all something given once and for all. Conversely, monopoly capital is doing its utmost to take them back from the mass of the working people. The Communists work, first and foremost, for the restoration of these rights and freedoms whenever they are suppressed, and for their preservation and extension.

Moreover, the Communists struggle not merely for the restoration of bourgeois democracy. Monopoly capital, preferring, as a rule, the fascist and authoritarian forms of dominance, nevertheless does not give up its key positions in the economy and politics under conditions of bourgeois democracy. It is wrong to think that monopoly rule and bourgeois democracy are mutually exclusive. Imperialism tries to get rid of political democracy but when it fails to do so it exercises its rule by means of that democracy.

Bourgeois democracy in itself does not give firm guarantees against evolution towards authoritarianism and overt dictatorship. On the contrary, monopolies use it to head for such evolution. The main point is, however, that under bourgeois democracy the vital needs of the broadest strata of the population, such as peace, national independence and sovereignty, an agrarian reform in the interests of the toiling peasantry, guaranteed jobs, emancipation of intellectuals from spiritual slavery under the heel of monopoly capital and equality between men and women, cannot be met. New democracy, capable of standing up for the interests of the people, is necessary to meet these needs. That is why the Communists stand for the rejuvenation of democracy as well as for its preservation. They advocate the establishment of a democratic government which, relying on the mass of the working people, could carry through an extensive programme of social and democratic reforms.

The present-day situation, characterised by a change in the world alignment of forces in favour of socialism and

peace, is creating more favourable conditions, in particular, for the struggle of the democratic forces in capitalist countries. The working class is striking, first and foremost, at capitalist monopolies, which are the worst enemy of the peasantry, craftsmen and other petty proprietors in the city, office employees, intellectuals and even part of medium-sized capitalists. The main forces of a nation have an interest in the abolition of undivided monopoly rule. This makes it possible to unite all the democratic movements opposed to the oppression of the financial oligarchy.

In capitalist countries Communists stand for the large-scale democratisation of the entire public life, which should affect not only politics, including broader powers for parliaments and local bodies of self-government, the establishment of a fair electoral system, etc. The proletariat stands for large-scale nationalisation on terms favouring the people, backs the demands of the peasantry for radical agrarian reforms and mobilises the mass of the people for vigorous opposition to the course of the financial oligarchy and monopolies, which are seeking to abrogate democratic freedoms and to establish an authoritarian regime.

Political Parties and Trade Unions

Parties have a great role to play in the political system of bourgeois society, because

struggle between them is the

most integral, comprehensive and full-fledged manifestation of the political struggle of classes.

The role of parties in bourgeois society has been constantly growing since its very inception. Imperialism has not only aggravated the antagonisms between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie but also dramatically polarised interests inside the capitalist class itself between the monopolies and other groups of the bourgeoisie. The activity of the mass of the people in politics has grown considerably. As a consequence, the number of parties increased and rivalry between them became more acute. In terms of their social nature, parties can be divided into proletarian, semi-proletarian, petty bourgeois, agrarian and bourgeois. Depending on the ideology professed by them and the aims they pursue in politics, they

are divided into communist, social-democratic, liberal, conservative, fascist and others. Finally, from the point of view of the role played by them in the political system of the country, they are divided into ruling and opposition.

The class structure of bourgeois society and its social relations predetermine the role of political parties in its life. Bourgeois parties are a tool of class domination. Communist and workers' parties are organisations of the class struggle of the working people under the leadership of the proletariat. Reformist parties perform the role of an adaptation mechanism. In some circumstances they join forces with bourgeois parties, usually when a threat to the rule of the bourgeoisie arises. But when there is no such threat, they may exert certain pressure on the ruling classes.

The role played by bourgeois parties in developed capitalist countries may vary as well. In the political system of the United States, for instance, they play for the most part the role of the electoral mechanism. State policy is directly influenced by the National Association of Industrialists, by major monopolies, including those comprising the military-industrial complex, by the American Chamber of Commerce and also by numerous "lobbies". In West German politics, the parties of the ruling classes play a more significant role and in Italy political parties are attached much importance in the political system of the country.

During the past few years the aggravation of the general crisis of capitalism enhanced considerably the role of communist parties. "The international working class and its political vanguard - the Communist and Workers' parties," the 26th CPSU Congress pointed out, "approached the eighties with confidence. They approached them as active fighters for the rights of the working people, and for peace and security of nations. The communist movement continued to expand its ranks, and to win increasing influence among the masses. Today, Communist parties are active in 94 countries. In Western Europe alone, some 800,000 new fighters have joined their ranks in the past ten years."¹

1. Documents and Resolutions. The 26th Congress..., p. 21.

It should be pointed out that the policies of a number of left-wing socialist and social-democratic parties have shifted to the left for the same reason. As a result, the communist parties can come into contact and even make alliances with them. Such alliances will undoubtedly add to the influence of the working people's parties on politics in capitalist countries. In establishing these contacts, communist parties always bear in mind that any ideological rapprochement of scientific communism and the reformism of the Social-Democrats is out of question.

Political parties in capitalist countries formalise their activities by issuing appropriate political acts, the most important of them being programmes, rules or constitutions, manifestoes, statements and declarations. Parties use these documents to formulate and popularise their political ideals, to work out the strategy and tactics of their activities and to define their attitude to major international issues. During the recent period, as contacts between different parties have become more extensive, joint statements, declarations and communiques of two or more parties appear quite often.

The party leader has a decisive role to play in making policy and carrying it out in a number of countries. He also directs the party's group in parliament and becomes the head of government (or president) when his party comes to power. In the United States, for instance, the president is not obliged even in form to follow the directives of his party. The chairman (secretary) of such parties is in fact only responsible for the organisation and carrying out of election campaigns. Even the congresses of these parties are convened on the eve of the next elections.

Trade unions are an important institution in the political system of bourgeois society. They are called upon to protect the economic rights of working people. Some of them are a weapon of the class struggle against capitalist oppression, others are a sort of buffer between entrepreneurs and workers and still others are a tool of reaction and play a treacherous role in the workers' struggle. There are capitalist countries in which trade unions have no visible role

in politics.

Bourgeois Theories of the Political System of Society

The crisis of the political system of bourgeois society is reflected in bourgeois theories. A characteristic

feature of most of them is idealism. The economic system of bourgeois society, far from being regarded as a factor determining the activity of the bourgeois state, is altogether ignored. All sorts of ideological conceptions, struggle between the contradictory interests of different strata of society and the professional skill of politicians are considered the decisive factors determining the nature of the state.

The capitalist state is viewed as a "supraclass institution" in all the bourgeois conceptions. At best some authors recognise that in the past the bourgeois state had a class character. Anti-communism is a particular feature of the bourgeois and reformist theories of the state.

The bourgeois theories of the state can be divided from the point of view of their political character into liberal (to which reformist ones are leaning), moderate and reactionary. Moreover, each of the above trends is heterogeneous.

The champions of that theory exploit the fact that in the age of imperialism the capitalist state began intervene in economics, ideology and culture on a larger scale. Faced with the upsurge of the scientific and technological revolution and the huge development of the productive forces, state-monopoly capitalism, having inflated its profits to gigantic proportions, has the possibility somewhat to improve the living standards of working people. In addition, the achievements of the proletariat in its class struggle in capitalist countries and the growing living standards of the population in the countries of the socialist community have forced the bourgeois state to take a number of measures in social affairs. Bourgeois ideologists are using these facts to proclaim that the bourgeois state has now become a "welfare state."

However, bourgeois scholars themselves have to admit that the present-day bourgeois state is far from being a

"welfare agency". Professor David March, for instance, recognises that the activity of the British state in the field of social services is obviously discriminatory on class grounds.¹

One more liberal conception is the doctrine of "pluralistic democracy", rooted in what is known as institutionalism, of which Maurice Horiou is commonly considered the founder.

After the Second World War that conception, slightly modernised, became even more widespread as the theory of "political pluralism", which is being enthusiastically preached by R. Hamilton, S. Hook, O. Toffler, D. Bell and others. In accordance with that conception, political power in bourgeois society is divided between organisations representing the interests of different strata of society. One consequence of this setup, bourgeois ideologists believe, is the "diffusion" of political power in society. The conception of "pluralistic democracy" in a more liberal form is preached by present day reformist ideologists, such as D. Strachey in Britain.

The theory of the staatsrecht, or "rule by law", is a moderate conception. It became widespread at the time of industrial capitalism, when the bourgeoisie was seeking to fend off excessive interference of the state in its affairs. The ideologists of the bourgeoisie were seeking to restrict the rule of the state by law. The idea of the staatsrecht was progressive in so far as it stood in opposition to feudal reaction. It should be borne in mind, however, that while demanding that the state observe the laws, the bourgeoisie at the same time wanted it not to interfere with their exploitation of the working people. The right of the bourgeoisie to exploitation was sanctified in law.

Interest in the staatsrecht conception has been revived in the recent period. This conception creates the illusion that under the rule of law citizens are "guaranteed" against the "arbitrariness" of the state.

The main flaw of this conception is the metaphysical counter-opposition of law to the state. The authors of that

1. D. March. The Future of the Welfare State, London, 1964,
pp. 118, 139.

conception are ignoring the fact that it is precisely the state that exercises supervision over the observance of law.

The more popular of the reactionary theories of bourgeois statehood is the conception of "the ruling elite" and its varieties. The bourgeois ideologists' interest in it nowadays can be explained by a move from democracy to reaction in the politics of bourgeois society. The varieties of the "ruling elite" conception are intended to justify the crisis of bourgeois democracy. One of them claims that a "technocratic elite" has come to rule bourgeois society today as a natural consequence of the scientific and technological revolution, which demands ever higher technical skills from those who govern society. The proponents of this brand of the conception believe that as a consequence of the "managerial revolution" the state has also fallen within the managers' grasp and lost its political character.¹

Other bourgeois ideologists say that power in society has been seized by a political elite. Still others claim that political power in society is shared by several elites, including the technocrats, scientists and politicians. The elites "share power between themselves and counter-balance one another". Many proponents of this view advocate the destruction of the main institutions of bourgeois democracy, such as the parliament, and the concentration of power in the hands of a small group of people.

The "ruling elite" conception is a justification of the tendency for the substitution of totalitarian regimes for bourgeois democracy.

Aware of the dangerous character of "elitism", the communist and workers' parties are resolutely struggling against all its manifestations as well as against the ideologies justifying it. All this shows that deep-going and insolvable contradictions characterising today's bourgeois society are reflected, in particular, in the character of the conceptions of bourgeois scientists regarding the capitalist state and the nature of the political system of bourgeois society.

1. See J. Galbraith, The New Industrial State, London, 1971.

3. Political Forms of Transition from Capitalism to Socialism

Following a socialist revolution, there emerges and develops the political system of socialist society, its central institution being the state of the working class with which all the strata of the working people are allied.

The founders of scientific communism - Marx and Engels -- formulated the idea of the dictatorship of the proletariat and defined the more substantial tasks of the state at the initial stage of the revolution, when the bourgeoisie is expropriated and the foundations of a new system built. Developing their doctrine, Lenin discovered Soviet government as a form of the dictatorship of the proletariat, put forward the idea of a federation of Soviet socialist republics and substantiated the principles of relationships between the USSR and bourgeois states. Lenin's ideas became embodied in the 1918 Constitution of the Russian Federation, the 1924 Constitution of the USSR and the 1936 Constitution of the USSR; they are at the basis of the latest, 1977 Soviet Constitution.

A wealth of truly invaluable experience of real socialism has been accumulated during the 60 odd years of the existence of the Soviet state and 30 years of the functioning of most of the other socialist countries. This is the experience of translating into practice the ideas and forecasts put forward by the founders of scientific communism and at the same time the experience of enriching, developing the Marxist doctrine and applying it to specific situations.

The countries of the world socialist system have reached different levels in their development and the forms of their states are different in many respects. But all of them are states of a new, socialist type, bound to replace the bourgeois state.

Historical Imperative of the Dictatorship of the Proletariat

in the hands of the State, i.e., of the proletariat organised

The proletariat needs political power "to wrest, by degrees, all capital from the bourgeoisie to centralise all instruments of production

as the ruling class; and to increase the total of productive forces as rapidly as possible."¹

Expounding this idea, Marx and Engels drew the conclusion that class struggle necessarily leads to the dictatorship of the proletariat and that this dictatorship alone ensures a transition to society without classes and without the state. Lenin developed the theory of the dictatorship of the proletariat on the basis of the experience of the international and Russian working-class movement in the epoch of imperialism.

The power of the working class differs from all the previous states chiefly in that coercion towards class enemies is not its main aspect. Relying on its state, the working class directs the gigantic economic, organisational, cultural, educational and ideological work involved in building a new, socialist society. Since the early years following the victory of the revolution it has been organising and leading the mass of the farming population. It involves in building a new life intellectuals, certain groups of whom were initially influenced to a certain extent by the bourgeoisie. As socialist transformations are carried out, all the working strata of the population are gradually embracing the positions of the working class under the deep-going influence of its progressive world outlook and realise that socialism meets their vital interests.

The practice of the USSR and other socialist countries has displayed a tendency for ever broader alliances of democratic forces on which the power of the working people relies from the outset. While in the USSR that alliance initially consisted of the poor peasantry (in addition to the working class) and only partially of the other non-proletarian strata of the working people, in People's Democracies it included since the victory of the people's revolutions the entire peasantry, the urban petty bourgeoisie and other democratic forces.

The working class of socialist countries has set numerous

1. K. Marx, F. Engels, Collected Works, Vol. 6, p. 504.

examples of most painstaking concern for the moods of the peasantry, concessions to it, compromises with it, etc. These principles are illustrated by a decree on nationalising the land, adopted in the early years of Soviet government. Similar concessions and compromises were often made with regard to bourgeois intellectuals and other non-proletarian strata of working people. The practice of China and some other People's Democracies has demonstrated the possibility of class compromises with that part of the middle bourgeoisie who are loyal to the rule of the working class.

The reactionary bourgeoisie, vigorously resisting socialist transformations, is a different matter. The working class can never guarantee it that it will never resort to coercion. Now we are dealing with a very important matter — the Communists' attitude to the use of coercion in the struggle for the victory of the new society. Contrary to the claims of opportunists, coercion in itself is not built into scientific socialism and its ideals. Coercion is "alien to our ideals," Lenin wrote. "...The entire trend of development," he stated, "is towards abolition of coercive domination of one part of society over another."¹ This great and noble objective is in accord with the means of struggle chosen by the Communists, who have always been opposed to the tactic of terror against individuals, to conspiracies of small groups, to military coups and putches, which have always been used fairly often by the reactionary bourgeoisie in its struggle against the people. Communism has always advocated a broad and truly democratic movement of the mass of people.

The orders making it possible to coerce people and to oppress and humiliate them are profoundly hateful to the class which itself has for centuries been subjected to oppression, ruthless victimisation and persecution. Neither does the working class nurture vengefulness towards its exploiters. It assumes power not to revenge itself but to build a new society emancipating people from exploitation and from oppression of any type. Pursuing its humane goals, the working class seeks to choose appropriate methods of struggle. The Communists use every possibility to do without violence both in the course of struggle for power and of building socialism.

¹. V.I. Lenin, Collected Works, Vol. 23, p. 69.

Bourgeois propaganda tries to present political suppression under the dictatorship of the proletariat exclusively as terror, repression and downright restrictions of democratic rights. But these extreme measures are only used in response to the active resistance of the bourgeoisie itself.

As far as it depends on the working class, it always prefers non-violent methods to repression. Indeed, the broader the stratum of the bourgeoisie is prepared to co-operation with the working class, the easier socialist transformations are carried out, the smaller sacrifices they demand, the sooner the knowledge and organisational skills of the loyal former capitalists and the intellectuals who leaned towards the bourgeoisie in the past become useful to the new society.

Having unleashed a civil war, Russian capitalists and land-owners themselves compelled Soviet government to resort to repression which only was a response to the violence of the overthrown exploiters. This was recognised by many impartial observers. Herbert Wells, who visited Russia in 1920, wrote in his book Russia in the Shadows that it was not communism but European imperialism that had drawn this huge, shattered and bankrupt empire into the six-year-long sapping war. Nor was it communism that tortured suffering and perhaps even dying Russia by incessant attacks, invasions and mutinies subsidised from without, and tried to strangle it with the monstrously ruthless blockade. The vengeful French creditor and the dumb British journalist bear far greater responsibility for this deadly agony than any Communist.

Diverse Forms of the
Dictatorship of the Pro-
letariat

specific circumstances of every country and the historical setting of its transition to socialism. That was foreseen by Lenin who wrote: "All nations will arrive at socialism - this is inevitable, but all will do so in not exactly the same way, each will contribute something of its own to some

The class nature of power, intended to be a tool of transition to socialism, manifests itself in diverse forms which reflect the

form of democracy, to some variety of the dictatorship of the proletariat, to the varying rate of socialist transformations in the different aspects of social life."¹

Relying on general conclusions from historical experience, Marxism-Leninism highlights the following specific forms of the political power of the working class: the 1871 Paris Commune, Soviet government, and people's democracy. The Paris Commune, as everyone knows, was held up by Marx and Engels as the first practical embodiment of the dictatorship of the proletariat. The Soviet form of the dictatorship of the proletariat was thoroughly analysed by Lenin. People's democracy emerged after the Second World War and its significance and specific features were discussed theoretically in the documents of communist and workers' parties.

The more important factors of the specific form of the power of the working class and methods of its operation include a more or less favourable alignment of the class forces within the country and a broad front of the proletariat's allies; the level of the country's industrial and cultural development; the state of war (or peace) at the time of the revolution; the peaceful (or non-peaceful) development of the revolution and the acute forms of class struggle (in particular, much depends on whether a civil war breaks out); the international situation, including assistance from other socialist countries; and historical and national traditions in the socio-political life. The most important thing here is the alignment of the class forces and the scope of the front of the proletarian allies.

The world's first victorious power of the working class asserted itself in Russia, a country with a moderately developed capitalist system and strong feudal and autocratic traditions. It was also important that the dominant group of the population in the country were the peasants. The Russian proletariat, with which the poor strata of the farming population were allied, faced the adversary as represented by the entire landowners' class and the bourgeoisie, while the petty

1. V.I. Lenin, Collected Works, Vol. 23, p. 69-70.

bourgeoisie was vacillating, often leaning towards counter-revolution (e.g., the Socialist Revolutionaries' mutiny in 1918), etc.

The Russian working class had to cope with the most desperate resistance of domestic counter-revolution, the forces of which were augmented many-fold by assistance from international capital. In addition, it was also important that the dictatorship of the proletariat in the USSR arose from conditions of imperialist war, when militarisation had pervaded all society. Lenin wrote that "a revolution which breaks out during a war ... is a particularly severe case of child-birth."¹

Despite these extremely unfavourable conditions, the world's first government of the working class displayed the sufficiently typical characteristics of a new socialist state and the entire political system of socialist society.

At the same time the Soviet government displayed at its early stages certain specific characteristics called for by the circumstances in which it had to function. To counter the merciless civil war unleashed by domestic counter-revolution with the support of international reaction, the Soviet government had temporarily to strip the bourgeoisie of its electoral rights. Incidentally, a mere two per cent of the population (2.5 million) were denied electoral rights at that time.

Lenin foresaw that future revolutions would take place in considerably milder circumstances and that democracy would be developed on a broader scale from the outset. He wrote that wherever the bourgeoisie did not put up such vicious resistance as it did in our country, the new government would be able to work without that violence "that was forced upon us by the Kerenskys and the imperialists." Other countries, Lenin pointed out, would be able to secure the rule of the working class "by a different, more humane road."²

1. V.I. Lenin, Collected Works, Vol. 27, p. 498.

2. V.I. Lenin, Collected Works, Vol. 29, p. 271.

The countries of people's democracy embarked on the socialist road in more favourable domestic and international conditions than the Soviet Union had done. The forms of political organisation in People's Democracies have a number of common characteristics rooted in the present stage of the general crisis of capitalism. This makes it possible to describe people's democracy as a new form of the dictatorship of the proletariat. At the same time the political organisation of each of those countries has many specific features related to their economic development levels and historical and national traditions.

The state forms of the People's Democracies emerged as a consequence of the liberation movement of the peoples against fascism and the vestiges of feudalism (where they still remained), and also against foreign oppression. An anti-fascist democratic front took shape in the course of that struggle. It comprised the working class, which from the outset was the leading force of the revolution, the peasantry, most of the intelligentsia, and in certain instances part of the middle bourgeoisie. The transition from the democratic to the socialist stage of revolution in those countries was carried out without civil wars. That was a symptomatic phenomenon, testifying to class shifts which had taken place in capitalist countries in the present epoch, to the ever greater isolation of the monopoly bourgeoisie and to the broadening of the front of the proletariat's allies in the socialist revolution.

A new major factor which had a favourable effect on the development of the People's Democracies was the existence of the powerful Soviet socialist state, which rendered comprehensive economic and political assistance to new governments.

People's democracy, unlike Soviet government, did not begin at once to perform the functions of the dictatorship of the proletariat. In some countries the communist and workers' parties did not as yet have firm majorities in parliaments and coalition governments at the initial stage of the revolution. Although they wielded much influence among the people, considerable sections of the peasantry, intelligentsia and middle strata of the population followed other

parties; in this situation the state was a form of the democratic power of the people aimed, first and foremost, against fascism and its henchmen. From the point of view of its class nature that power was the revolutionary-democratic dictatorship of the proletariat and the peasantry.

From the outset the working class played the leading role in the democratic coalition but immediately after the people's democratic revolution it shared power with other classes. It was an intermediate, transitory kind of state, the fate of which depended on the alignment of class forces within the general democratic bloc and on the results of the class struggle between the working people and the right-wing bourgeois elements.

A broader alliance of the class forces on which people's democracy relies has made it possible to expand the limits of political democracy. Restrictions of political rights were only applied to a small number of the henchmen of the nazi invaders, to the traitors to their people. From the very beginning democracy was extended to all the strata of the peasantry, the urban petty bourgeoisie, the intellectuals and other democratic and national forces.

In China, the people's government relied on a broad social base at the beginning of the revolution. The national liberation front in that country began to emerge during the war against Japan and united all the strata of the population, including the numerically strong national bourgeoisie. Most of the democratic allies of the working class gradually embraced the positions of support for socialism upon the formation of the People's Republic of China.

Although the Soviets and people's democracy as two forms of the power of the working people led by the working class are the same in their fundamental aspects, there are also differences between them due to specific historical circumstances in which they emerged.

First, there are many parties led by Marxist-Leninist parties in some People's Democracies. Unlike Russia, in which not only bourgeois landowners' but also petty-bourgeois parties were opposed to the proletarian revolution, a number of People's Democracies saw many such parties supporting the transition to the socialist stage of the revolution. They

recognise the leading role of the working class and its Marxist-Leninist party and join it in ensuring the further progress of society along the socialist way.

Second, the communist and workers' parties in People's Democracies exercise their leading role not only through government bodies, trade unions and other mass organisations, as is the case in the USSR, but also through the people's (or national) front as a new organisational form of the alliance of the working class, the peasantry, the petty bourgeoisie and the intelligentsia.

Third, people's democracy has certain specific features in the organization of the machinery of government and administration. A number of countries made use of certain erstwhile forms of national representation in creating the machinery of the new power, such as transformed parliaments (the National Assembly in Czechoslovakia, the Sejm in Poland, etc.). The breakdown of the old state machinery was also carried out in different forms in those countries. In some of them the more reactionary components of the old machinery that have been in nazi service (such as the army and police) were abolished in the course of democratic transformations and a new, democratic machinery was established. Subsequently the entire machinery of administration was gradually transformed to meet the needs of building socialism.

The participation of the more or less broad strata of the bourgeoisie in national alliances in a number of People's Democracies gave rise to the problem of establishing cooperation with and at the same time of re-educating whole classes which bore an exploitative nature in the past.

Historical experience has provided us with the following models of basic political regimes in socialist states.

Proletarian democracy, which is characterised as a class democracy, ensuring obvious advantages, in particular, those formalised constitutionally, for the proletariat in the electoral system and bodies of government before other classes and which overtly curtails democracy for the propertied classes; this regime is exemplified by Soviet Government in the early years of its existence.

Democracy of the whole people, which is characterised by the consistent implementation of the fundamental characteristics of the socialist state (of the whole people) as the power of the mass of the working people led by the working class under conditions of victorious socialism and actually expanding real rights and freedoms for the working people; it is the Soviet state at the present stage of its development.

People's democracy, which ensures the guidance of the state by the working class with which the peasantry and petty bourgeoisie are allied but which does not directly curtail democracy for those representatives of the propertied classes who are loyal to the people's rule; this regime is exemplified by European socialist countries at the early stage of their existence. At present they have carried out or are carrying out the transition to full-scale socialist democracy.

New democracy which is characterised by an alliance of the class forces that include, in addition to the working class, the peasantry and the petty bourgeoisie, the national bourgeoisie; democracy is directly curtailed only for the compradores bourgeoisie.

Having built the foundations of socialism, European socialist countries went over to complete the construction of socialist society and to build advanced socialism. As for the Soviet Union, it has built advanced socialist society with the resultant transformation of the political system in our country.

In this way, the practice of people's democracies has fully corroborated Lenin's ideas that the further history advances the more favourable conditions will become for the development of the democratic forms of the rule of the working class from the very outset of socialist revolution.

On Future Forms of the Working-Class Power

The communist and workers' parties are doing a good deal to study problems of the future forms of power wielded by the working class, methods of activity of the state and the party system, the role of democracy, and ways of its transition to socialism with due regard for the development levels

of countries, historical traditions and the political cultures of individual nations.

Today, the non-socialist world is made up by at least three groups of countries, namely, countries of highly developed capitalism, countries of medium-developed capitalism and developing countries. They differ from one another not only in the levels of economic and industrial development but also in the levels of social and political development. The degree of the development of the working class and its movement, the character of the party system, the role of the state, the political regime, the level of mass consciousness and political culture, all demand an indepth concrete analysis of all the three types of countries and every individual country. The factor of sustained national democratic traditions, e.g., in France, Italy or Britain, well-established capitalist practices, or the tradition of authoritarian rule in many Latin American countries cannot be disregarded in appraising the present-day bourgeois state and the level and social content of democracy, and therefore the ways of struggle for socialism and forms of the future rule of the working class. Relying on the international experience of real socialism, communist parties in non-socialist countries analyse in depth the national circumstances of every country.

Listed below are the factors which are bound to influence the forms and methods of rule of the working class in the more developed capitalist countries.

It is to be expected that the alignment of class forces will be more favourable than it was in previous revolutions and that socialist democracy will from the outset rely on a broader base than before. The grounds for this supposition are supplied by the further stratification of classes in capitalist countries as a consequence of the rise of state-monopoly capitalism and the isolation of the increasingly narrow oligarchic group of monopolists confronting the people.

The struggle for the development and renovation of democracy and for the restriction and then curbing of monopoly rule is becoming the objective of workers, peasants and middle strata of the urban population alike.

The existence of a relatively well-developed working-class movement and also democratic traditions cannot but influence the forms of power of the working class. There is not a single capitalist country in which there would be no communist parties or groups, a more or less developed trade union movement and organisations of petty bourgeois democracy.

The growth and strengthening of the system of socialist countries is exerting a great revolutionising influence on the whole of social life on earth and on the ways and forms of the peoples' transition to socialism. The achievements of socialism in the economy and culture, in raising the living standards and in extending democracy and freedom are growing from year to year. They are winning over to the side of socialism millions of working people in capitalist countries. As a result, the number of allies of the working class in every capitalist country is growing, which makes for broader possibilities of using the democratic methods of struggle for socialism.

Lastly, the possibility to avert world wars today may create a new historical situation for transition to socialism. Up to now socialist revolutions were linked with world wars, which generated worldwide crises - "economic, political, national and international".¹ They expedited revolutions but at the same time left an indelible imprint on the forms and methods of class struggle and therefore on the functioning of the dictatorship of the proletariat. Transition to socialism under conditions of peace and peaceful coexistence of states will create more favourable conditions for the development of the democratic aspects of proletarian rule.

All these factors give grounds to hope that democracy will be even more important than before both in the course of socialist revolution and in the forms and methods of the exercise of power by the working class.

However, mention should also be made of adverse factors, such as, first and foremost, the unparalleled growth of the

¹. V.I. Lenin, Collected Works, Vol. 23, p. 299.

night of monopoly capital and its coalescence with the state. The state machinery and the army, the bulwarks of the dominant class, have grown immeasurably. The unity of international capital, intervening in the affairs of individual capitalist countries, has also grown. Extremely reactionary forms of government, persecuting the Communists and all the other progressive elements, have become entrenched in a number of countries. It is therefore clear that transition to socialism in many capitalist countries involves the implementation of general democratic reforms, the restoration and renovation of democracy and curtailment of the rule of monopolies and the army.

Obviously, both the course of socialist revolution and the forms and methods of working-class rule would be individualised to a considerable degree in those countries where radical reforms could be carried out to limit and eliminate monopoly rule. These individual characteristics would make themselves felt in at least three areas, namely, methods of expropriation of the bourgeoisie, the role of parliamentary institutions and the possibility for non-proletarian parties to participate in building socialism under the leadership of a working-class party.

Of course, the forms of expropriation of the bourgeoisie which were used in socialist countries cannot be ruled out. At the same time the possibility (never renounced by Communists) of buying the implements and means of production from the bourgeoisie (partially and sometimes, perhaps, even in full) has become more realistic.

Communist parties in a number of capitalist countries proceed from the assumption that in those countries which have solid democratic traditions the working class may, in the course of class struggle, turn the parliament into a tool of the mass of the working people. Of course, the traditional parliamentary form of government will have to be filled with a new social content. It is also likely, furthermore, that transition to socialism in developed capitalist countries will be carried out under conditions of a multi-party system with the leading role of a Marxist-Leninist party. These conclusions are reflected in the policy documents of the communist parties

of France, Italy, Britain and other capitalist countries.

Unlike the reformists, however, the Communists believe that in any case the working class has to carry out a revolution, to establish its rule capable of defending the revolutionary gains and carrying out socialist transformations.

Practice shows that the basic and inalienable characteristics of socialist revolution and of building socialism remain effective. In report "The Great October Revolution and Mankind's Progress" is stressed that "the sum total of experience in the development of world socialism provides convincing evidence, among other things, of the following:

"the question of power continues to be the main issue in a revolution. It is either the power of the working class, acting in alliance with all the working people, or the power of the bourgeoisie. There is no third possibility;

"transition to socialism is possible only if the working class and its allies, having gained real political power, use it to end the socio-economic domination of capitalist and other exploiters;

"socialism can be victorious only if the working class and its vanguard, the Communists, are able to inspire and unite the working people as a whole in the struggle to build the new society, to transform the economy and all social relations along socialist lines;

"socialism can consolidate its position only if the working people's power is capable of defending the revolution against any attacks by the class enemy (and such attacks are inevitable, both internal and, most of all, external)."¹

These are only some of the lessons of the present-day development of socialism. They confirm anew the absolute correctness of Lenin, who wrote: "It is the Russian model that reveals to all countries something -- and something highly significant -- of their near and inevitable future."²

-
1. L.I. Brezhnev, Our Course: Peace and Socialism, Novosti Press Agency Publishing House, Moscow, 1978, p. 179.
 2. V.I. Lenin, Collected Works, Vol. 31, p. 22.

4. The Political System of Advanced Socialist Society

Having completed the period of transition and the building of a close-knit socialist society on which the founders of Marxism-Leninism concentrated their attention, the CPSU found itself faced with the new tasks of developing socialism on its own basis. Relying on the scientific forecasts of the founders of our doctrine and analysing newly gained practical experience, the CPSU drafted a programme for the further development of socialism and for transition to communism. The new Soviet Constitution, adopted in 1977, reflected the basic theoretical ideas of the CPSU and other Marxist-Leninist parties of socialist countries.

The political system of advanced socialist society is the power of the Soviet people, the basic institutions of which are the state of the whole people and the CPSU; its social role consists in the guidance and supervision of the constructive activity of the Soviet people in their struggle for the victory of communism.

There are three periods in the development of Soviet society and its political system: the transition period, which ends with building the foundations of socialism and to which the state of the dictatorship of the proletariat corresponds; the period of building advanced socialist society, at which the state of the dictatorship of the proletariat grows into a state of the whole people; and the present stage, to which the political system of advanced socialist society corresponds. The new Soviet Constitution is a practical embodiment of the ideas of advanced socialism and the state of the whole people as the pivotal ideas determining the development and functioning of the political system at the present stage.

The basic functions of the political system of advanced socialism are as follows:

1. Definition of the goals and tasks of society and the drafting of a programme of action in accordance with the interests of the working class, the toiling peasantry, the people's intelligentsia, all the nations and nationalities of the country and all the social groups.

The process of building communism as the ultimate goal of social development is broken down into a number of stages and periods, each of them being characterised by its specific objectives, tasks and ways of accomplishing them. The main role in this process is played by the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, the leading and guiding force of the whole of Soviet society, its political system and all the government and non-government organisations.

2. Organisation of the society's activity in the struggle for the accomplishment of its goals and tasks and mobilisation of resources for this purpose. The exercise of this function involves all the elements of the political system. The CPSU is responsible for political leadership of society. The Soviet state concentrates directly on the administration, organisation and control. The trade unions and other mass organisations are playing a great role in the exercise of this function.

3. Strengthening the socio-political and ideological unity of society, enhancement of its social homogeneity and the progress of its socialist culture. The primary role in the exercise of this function is played by the CPSU and its ideological activity, with government bodies and non-government organisations also contributing substantially to it. It should be pointed out that all the sections of the Constitution defining the foundations of the socio-political and economic systems formulate the tasks of the further social and cultural integration of Soviet society.

4. Distribution of wealth in accordance with the interests of society as a whole, individual classes, social groups, nations and nationalities, and every individual. The economic and socio-cultural systems play a major role in the exercise of this function. However, the decisive say in this matter belongs to the political system, which takes decisions binding on society in the distribution of national wealth, material and spiritual values and which plans measures to raise the living and cultural standards of the working people..

All this shows that the main social purpose of the political system of the USSR is to ensure the realisation of the potentialities for comprehensive social progress that are inherent in socialist society. By defining the tasks and goals

of society, contributing to the mobilisation of its resources, directing the efforts of society at achieving common goals and organising their accomplishment, the political system acts as a most important factor of social development as a whole.

Primary role is played here by the formulation of policy as an integral whole and of its individual components, including social, economic, cultural, scientific and technical policies, and also by the development of long-and short-term plans and programmes of economic, social and cultural development, by the formulation of principal objectives, by decision-making on their basis, by the mobilisation of resources and by the organisation of execution and control. These methods are particularly important at the stage of advanced socialist society, which provides possibilities for the implementation of long-term programmes and plans for economic, social and cultural development.

The historical superiority of the political system of socialism over the bourgeois system consists precisely in the fact that it ensures the most favourable conditions for the mobilisation of resources for the benefit of social progress on the basis of planned management of social and economic processes, and also for the development of the social activity and initiative of citizens. The policy of the CPSU and the Soviet state encourages this comprehensive activity and directs it towards building communism.

The State of the Whole People

The state of the whole people
is a major institution of the
political system of advanced
socialism.

The Soviet Constitution formulates the goals, tasks and functions of the state of the whole people in accordance with the Party's Programme. "The supreme goal of the Soviet state is the building of a classless, communist society in which there will be public, communist self-government," the Preamble to the Constitution reads. "The main aims of the socialist state of the whole people are: to lay the material and technical base of communism, to perfect socialist social relations and transform them into communist relations, to mould the citizen of communist society, to raise the people's

living and cultural standards, to safeguard the country's security, and to further the consolidation of peace and development of international cooperation."¹

There is absolute continuity between the state of the whole people and the state which existed at the first two stages of the development of socialism. From its inception the socialist state has inbuilt in it the characteristics of the state of the whole people because it represents the will and interests of not only the working class but also the working peasantry and intelligentsia. The state of the whole people is carrying on the struggle for the implementation of the aims of the dictatorship of the proletariat, namely, the building of communist society. It is exercising on the international scene the principles which were typical of the dictatorship of the proletariat, namely, support for and solidarity with all the revolutionary forces of the present epoch. At the same time there are a number of features which are typical of the state of the whole people.

First, the social base of the socialist state is further expanded as a result of the establishment of the state of the whole people, and it comes to express the interests and will of the working class, the peasantry, the intelligentsia, and all the nations and nationalities of the country.

Second, while the state of the dictatorship of the proletariat was tackling the tasks of building socialism and advanced socialist society, the state of the whole people discharges the immediate task of strengthening advanced socialism and building communism. It contributes to the enhancement of social homogeneity, to the obliteration of substantial differences between the town and the countryside, between work by brain and work by hand, and to the further drawing closer together of all the nations and nationalities of the USSR.

Third, the state of the whole people heralds a new stage in the development of socialist democracy, which is manifest in the organisation and functioning of the entire

1. Constitution (Fundamental Law) of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, pp. 14-15.

political system, ensuring effective administration of all the affairs of society, ever more active participation of working people in the affairs of the state, and the combination of real human rights and freedoms with civic responsibility.

Fourth, the state of the whole people signifies a higher level of scientific organisation and management on the basis of a qualitative improvement in the political awareness and political culture of officials and the mass of the population and the use of the achievements of the scientific and technological revolution.

Fifth, the state of the whole people as a component of the world socialist community is promoting friendship, cooperation and comradely mutual assistance with socialist countries on the basis of socialist internationalism, participates in economic integration and the socialist division of labour, pursues Leninist peace policy and builds its relations with other states on the basis of the peaceful coexistence of states with different social systems.

The successful functioning of the state of the whole people is conditional on the observance of the principles of democratic centralism and socialist legality.

What are the main tasks of the state of the whole people? In economic relations the state protects socialist property and creates conditions for its growth. Combining material and moral incentives, it tries to ensure that work becomes man's primary vital requirement. Relying on the creative activity of the working people, on socialist emulation and on the achievements of scientific and technical progress, the state ensures the growth of labour productivity, an increase in the efficiency of production, an improvement in the quality of work, and the dynamic, proportionate development of the national economy according to plan. The economy is run on the basis of state economic and social development plans through combining centralised administration with the economic independence and initiative of enterprises and other organisations and effective use of management accounting, profit, and cost-price. Major functions of the state involve the protection and scientific and rational use of the land, mineral resources, animal

and plant life, the preservation of pure air and water, and the reproduction of natural resources and the improvement of the environment.

In social relations, the Soviet state contributes to the advance of social homogeneity, including the obliteration of class distinctions, substantial differences between the town and the countryside and between work by brain and work by hand, and to the comprehensive development and drawing closer together of all the nations and nationalities of the USSR. It aims at extending real possibilities for all citizens to develop and apply their creative powers, capabilities and gifts with the ultimate objective being the comprehensive and harmonious development of the individual.

The state takes care to improve working conditions, to reduce and eventually eliminate arduous manual work, on the basis of comprehensive mechanisation and automation of production, and is consistently implementing a programme for making agricultural work a variety of industrial work. The state is unswervingly pursuing a course of raising pay rates and the real incomes of the working people in line with the growth of labour productivity. The function of control over the amount of work and amount of consumption is given a new content. The state, assisted on a large scale by mass organisations and work collectives, ensures the growth and fair distribution of the public consumption funds, and develops the state system of health care, social security, communal services, public catering and utilities.

In culture, the state improves the integrated system of public education, ensures the planned development of science and the training of scientific workers, organises the introduction of the results of scientific research in the national economy and other fields, takes care to protect the spiritual values of society and to ensure their large-scale use for legal and aesthetic education and for raising the cultural standards of the Soviet people.

In foreign policy, the Soviet state is unflaggingly pursuing Leninist peace policy and working for stronger security for the peoples and for large-scale international co-operation.

Soviet foreign policy, as the Soviet Constitution stresses, is aimed at ensuring international conditions favourable for building communism in the USSR, safeguarding the state interests of the Soviet Union, consolidating the positions of world socialism, supporting the struggle of peoples for national liberation and social progress, preventing wars of aggression, achieving universal and complete disarmament, and consistently implementing the principle of the peaceful coexistence of states with different social systems.

Defence of the socialist homeland is a major function of the state, which ensures the security and defence capability of the country and equips its defence forces with everything they need.

An analysis of today's politics makes it possible to trace a deeper relationship between domestic and foreign policies and to take into account the influence of a number of additional factors in formulating foreign policy, among them protection of national interests by the dominant class in conditions of growing contradictions between imperialist states and the indirect influence of opposition with which the ruling forces have to reckon.

International politics is becoming one of the factors influencing domestic politics particularly strongly in our epoch. Developing countries with yet unstable political institutions supply characteristic examples in this respect. The processes of their further development depend to a large extent not only on internal factors but also on international factors, on the influence of the socialist and the capitalist systems, and on the extension of economic and political relations with them.

To Lenin goes the credit for the formulation of the principles of the peaceful coexistence of states with different social systems.¹ He stressed that socialism, owing to its nature of a social system expressing the vital interests of the working class and all the working people, strives to safeguard peace between peoples and states.² That is why the

1. See V.I. Lenin, Collected Works, Vol. 30, p. 39.

2. Ibid., Vol. 33, pp. 55, 148-149.

socialist countries seek to develop normal economic and political relations with capitalist countries.

At the same time a major aspect of the activity of socialist countries consists in rendering support to all the revolutionary forces in capitalist countries and in extending solidarity with the working-class and national liberation movements.¹

The Party in the Political System

In the political system of advanced socialism, the CPSU is the leading and guiding force of Soviet society, the core of this system and of all

the state and social organisations.

Equipped with the Marxist-Leninist doctrine, the Communist Party defines the general prospects for the development of society, the line of Soviet domestic and foreign policies, guides the great constructive activity of the Soviet people, and imparts a planned and scientific character to the efforts to build communism.

The concept of political leadership acquires particularly great importance with regard to the party's activity at the stage of advanced socialism. It is the party that arms the people with an explicit scientific programme of their advance. Primary importance is attached to the formulation by the party of scientific policies in every field, including the economy, social relations, culture and international affairs. The function of policy-making and the adoption of fundamental political decisions becomes extremely important as the processes of social development grow more complex, the scientific and technical revolution continues to unfold, and also as the role and responsibility of the Soviet state in the international scene for the destinies of world peace and the security of the nations grows, economic, scientific, technical and cultural contacts with all the states of the world expand and struggle against imperialism is carried on.

1. See V.I. Lenin, Collected Works, Vol. 28, pp. 292-293.

Primary importance in the party's activities today is attached to the formulation of goals and programmes of social action, including ultimate, intermediate and regional goals in the economic, social and political life. An objective and scientific approach to the formulation of the goals and programmes of action is a major condition of the effective functioning of our political system as a whole.

Ideological education, relying on a comprehensive approach, has a special role to play in the party's political leadership. The party inculcates in the people political awareness and political culture, which constitute a major condition for the political activity of all the working people. Based on the economy and class structure, socio-political consciousness is becoming a major independent factor of social life as a whole and of political activity in particular. Relying on Marxism-Leninism, the party is constantly and perseveringly carrying out large-scale work aimed at raising the level of political consciousness, or a system of notions developed by social groups and individuals with regard to political power, political dynamics and administration. Political social consciousness in its most general form is reflected in the political culture of Soviet society, which is an important factor influencing the development and functioning of the political system and all the political institutions, and on the understanding and observance of political and legal regulations.

The main direction of the development of the political system of Soviet society is the further extension of

Development of Socialist Democracy

socialist democracy. It means the ever broader participation of working people in managing the affairs of society and the state, the democratisation of the state apparatus, the enhancement of the activity of mass organisations, the tightening of people's control, the consolidation of the legal basis in state and public affairs, the extension of publicity and continuous respect for public opinion.

A major means of developing socialist democracy is the continuous extension of the social and political rights of citizens. The 1936 Soviet Constitution fixed the basic

rights of Soviet people, including the right to work, to rest and leisure, to education and to maintenance in old age. The 1977 Soviet Constitution added to them the rights to health protection, to housing, to enjoying cultural benefits, and also the freedom of scientific, technical and artistic creative work.

The socio-economic rights of the working people include the right to participate in the administration of state and public affairs. The main forms of the exercise of this right are as follows: citizens of the USSR elect and may be elected to the Soviets of People's Deputies, participate in the discussion and drafting of bills and decisions of national and local importance, in the work of government bodies and cooperative and other social organisations, in controlling their activities, in managing the production affairs of work collectives, and in meeting at places of residence. Another new constitutional principle is the fixed right of every Soviet citizen to submit proposals to government bodies and mass organisations on improvements in their activities and to criticise shortcomings in their work.

Work collectives have a special role to play in the political system of advanced socialist society. It is they that are the primary social groups in which individual and social-political interests are directly synthetised and the political consciousness of the mass of the population is shaped up.

The Soviet political system is characterised by different forms of direct democracy, enabling citizens to exercise control over the machinery of state administration immediately and not only through their representative bodies, and also contributing to more effective relationships between bodies of government and the population. The forms of direct democracy include mass-scale discussions of bills, national economic development plans and other major documents of the state; participation of the working people in supervision of the activities of production management and in resolving the problems of work collectives; officials' reports to citizens; the obligation of government bodies to receive the population and to consider all the proposals, applications and

complaints submitted by citizens; contributions by citizens to the press and their participation in the on-site inspections by newspaper reporters and in bodies of people's control; consumer conferences, etc.

More than two million working people are elected to the Soviets in the USSR and almost 30 million Soviet citizens actively cooperate with the Soviets, assisting voluntarily and free of charge in the great and complex matter of state administration. Altogether 9 million working people participate in the elective bodies of people's control, closely watching the activities of different bodies of government and combatting manifestations of red tape and misuse of powers. Altogether 65 per cent of all members of permanent production conferences that have been set up in Soviet industry work directly in production.

The press and other mass media are an effective means of expressing public opinion and fostering communist mores. The overwhelming majority of periodicals are controlled not by the state but by political and social organisations, among them the party, the trade unions, intellectual unions and cooperative societies. Regular exchanges of opinion on economic, cultural and scientific problems, the striving to involve in the work of the press not only full-time journalists but also rank-and-file workers, large-scale publication of information about the functioning of government institutions and polarisation of advanced experience and scientific ideas are those characteristics which distinguish the socialist press from capitalist-controlled publications. The press is not only a tool of propaganda but also a means of control over the smooth functioning of all the institutions of socialist democracy and over the observance of the rights of citizens and socialist legality.

The obligation of all the government bodies, mass organisations and officials to show respect for the individual and to protect the rights of Soviet people is an important element of constitutional guarantees. The latest Soviet Constitution guarantees the right of Soviet citizens to legal protection against encroachments on their life and health, property, personal freedom, honour and dignity. This regula-

tion extends substantially the legal guarantees of the rights and freedoms enjoyed by Soviet people, including the newly adopted norm stipulating the right of citizens to file complaints against officials with government bodies and mass organisations and have those complaints considered according to the procedures and within the time limits specified by law. Citizens of the USSR also have the right to appeal against actions by officials that contravene the law or exceed their powers, and infringe the rights of citizens, and the right to compensation for damage resulting from unlawful actions by government and non-government organisations, or by officials in the performance of their duties. These new additional legal guarantees of the rights and freedoms of citizens constitute a major feature of the functioning of the state of the whole people and the enhancement of control exercised over its activities by all the working people.

Citizens of the USSR have the right to associate in social organisations that promote their political activity and initiative and contribute to the satisfaction of their various interests.

These rights and freedoms have been granted to the Soviet people in accordance with the interests of the working people and in order to strengthen the socialist system and to build communism, in other words, in full accordance with the goals proclaimed by the Soviet Constitution.

The ideological and political struggle over the problem of human rights has laid bare two diametrically opposite approaches, one democratic and the other liberal. Socialism is translating into practice a truly democratic approach, based first and foremost on concern for the rights of the mass of the population, the working people. The bourgeois-liberal approach centers on protecting the rights of the privileged elite, first and foremost proprietors and also the technocrats, government officials, higher officers and the upper strata of workers in culture, science and art. Socialist democracy lays emphasis primarily on social rights, such as the right to work, to rest and leisure, to education and to socio-economic freedoms, above all the freedom from exploitation of

man by man. The liberal-bourgeois approach stresses the narrowly interpreted freedom of speech, freedom of the press, although it is common knowledge that all the means that guarantee these freedoms, including the newspapers, radio, television and printing facilities, are controlled by monopoly capital.

The system of the obligations of citizens, just as the system of their rights, has an economic, socio-cultural and political character.

Citizens of socialist countries are obliged to respect the constitutions of their countries, to work honestly and conscientiously, to preserve and protect socialist property and to defend their socialist homeland.

One of the major duties of citizens in socialist countries is observance of the principles of proletarian internationalism, including respect for national dignity, promotion of friendship and cooperation with the peoples of other countries and maintenance and consolidation of world peace.

The very nature of the obligations of citizens of socialist countries expresses as effectively as their rights and freedoms the specifics and advantages of socialist democracy, pervaded with the idea of honest service to other people, to society as a whole, to the state, and to the cause of security, social progress and peace.

As communism is being built, a gradual transition takes place to social self-government

Social Self-Government

ent. Communist social self-government is a non-political, non-state form of administration of economic, social and cultural processes in a classless society. It presupposes the active and personal participation of every member of society in deciding questions of national importance and ensures the fullest possible realisation of the ideals of freedom, equality and fraternity among people.

Transition to communist social self-government will result in the withering away of the state, i.e., the replacement of political state power, following the obliteration of differences between classes, with a system of administration which will no longer be political in nature and which will

be exercised without a special machinery of compulsion. The process of the withering away of the state will require certain domestic and international conditions.

From the point of view of domestic conditions, the economic prerequisites for the withering away of the state include highly developed productive forces and the practical implementation of the principle of communism "from each according to his abilities, to each according to his needs." The main social condition of the withering away of the state is the disappearance of the classes and of traces of the division of society into classes. In a classless society, people will gradually become used to observing social community rules without state compulsion. The law will be replaced by norms of communist morality and by communist customs.

The withering away of state compulsion and the substitution of morality for law will not take place overnight but will come into being gradually, as communist society matures. This presupposes the development of a new man, who will be perfectly aware of public interests, imbued with a sense of communist humanism, and possessing thorough knowledge and high cultural standards.

When there are no classes, there will be no need for the state. "State interference in social relations becomes, in one domain after another, superfluous, and then dies out of itself; the government of persons is replaced by the administration of things, and by the conduct of processes of production. The state is not 'abolished'. It dies out."¹

The withering away of the state also depends on external conditions. While there remains the threat of aggression on the part of imperialist states, the function of defence of the country is preserved in full and will only wither away when socialism ultimately triumphs on a world-wide scale. Therefore, the process of withering away of the state can only be completed when communism fully triumphs within the country and when the risk of attack from without disappears.

1. F. Engels, Anti-Dühring, p. 341.

Transition to communist social self-government is a complex and multifaceted process, which includes the gradual transformation of the entire political system of socialist society and all the state and social institutions. There will eventually emerge in the centre and in the localities universal organisations of a new type concerned with running the affairs of society, organisations which will embrace everything of the best which will have been accumulated by that time in the course of the development of state and social organisations and ultimately replace them.

The development of democracy in every area, the growing role of social organisations, the enhancement of democratic principles in the functioning of the state machinery and the development of direct forms of management of production and the affairs of society as a whole constitute the ways for transition to communist social self-government.

Transition to communist social self-government is not an instantaneous act but a gradual dialectical process. It manifests itself in the development and improvement of the entire political system of Soviet society and in the further unfolding of socialist democracy.

5. Political Systems in the Developing Countries of Asia and Africa

The term "developing countries" is commonly used with reference to Asian and African states, with the exception of countries which have reached the imperialist stage of development (such as Japan and the Republic of South Africa), and also of socialist states. Developing countries have travelled different roads of political evolution. Most of them had not achieved independent statehood before the end of the Second World War, when the colonial system of imperialism had disintegrated. Those countries differ substantially from one another in size, population and technological and economic development. For instance, traditional, patriarchal forms of economic relations prevail in certain countries of Tropical Africa, whereas capitalist structures have become dominant in most Asian states. But what is most important is that the social orientations of the emergent states are quite different

and often totally opposite. These countries are very different. After liberation, some of them have been following the revolutionary-democratic path. In others capitalist relations have taken root. Some of them are following a truly independent policy, while others are today taking their lead from imperialist policy. In a nutshell, the picture is a fairly motley one.

In most of the countries belonging to the group under review (among them India, Pakistan, Zaire, Indonesia and Kenya), the exploiting classes or social strata which ultimately represent the interests of the exploiters, succeeded in directing the development of society and the state along capitalist lines. Another group of states (about 20 countries with an aggregate population of almost 150 million), in which power has been taken by revolutionary democrats, have chosen a socialist orientation and by now achieved different stages in creating conditions for building socialism in the future. These two types of political systems pursue diametrically opposite aims, but, nevertheless, there are certain similarities between them.

Political Systems of Asian and African Countries

The factors responsible for the community of substantial features of the political systems under review include

their efforts to ensure independent development and relevant coincidence of national tasks, the backwardness that is characteristic of all the emergent countries, their lingering dependence, in different forms, on the capitalist world, and the transitory nature of their society.

Many characteristic features of the structure and functioning of the political systems in these countries are determined by the fact that in most of them no single class concentrates in its hands full political power. The developing countries, with the exception of a handful of them in which state power is exercised by the national bourgeoisie (e.g., India) or the feudal lords (e.g., Oman and Qatar), are governed by an alliance of classes, either the national bourgeoisie and feudal lords (e.g., Morocco and Jordan), or the working people and a certain part of the non-working strata of the

population in socialist-oriented countries. In a number of capitalist-oriented countries in Tropical Africa, where the formation of classes has not yet been completed, power belongs to a specific intermediate social grouping which is evolving into exploiting classes.

Another common feature of the political systems of the developing countries is a special role of the state, which dominates the political systems in most of them. In capitalist-oriented countries, political parties are viewed first of all as a tool of struggle for state power and a means of retaining it. For this reason, although certain countries with one-party systems proclaim that all the basic institutions of the state are the arms of the ruling party (for instance, this is the case in Zaire according to its Constitution of 1974), in reality the latter often is merely an appendage to the state machinery. This also holds true, although with reservations, for those socialist-oriented countries in which revolutionary-democratic parties, due to a number of reasons do not as yet fulfil in full measure the functions of the leader of the state.

A major political role played by the army is a common feature of all the developing states. Many of them are governed by military regimes, under which all the parties and other social organisations are usually banned. As a consequence, the state as represented by the army leadership, becomes virtually the only element of the political system. The military who govern the country express the interests of certain social and class forces. Sometimes military dictatorships are a consequence of the overthrow of progressive regimes (coups in Indonesia in 1965, in Ghana in 1966, etc.). In other instances, conversely, the take-over by the army led by progressive officers paves the way for socialist development.

The political systems of all the countries under review are characterised by the survival of archaic elements, and by the strong impact of customs and traditional, including religious, norms of behaviour on politics, which explains the underdeveloped character of political culture and democratic institutions. They are integrated and intertwined.

on the one hand, with institutions and principles reflecting the influence of the political system of capitalism and, on the other, with new elements caused by the influence of socialist political systems. Naturally, the correlation of these elements differs from one country to another. In India, Tunisia and some other countries, for instance, there preserves an indepth influence of political institutions and principles of bourgeois origin, among them the conception of the separation of powers and parliamentarism. The countries of Tropical Africa display strong evidence of the influence of tribal aristocracy on political processes. Tribal chiefs, although deprived of administrative powers in most cases, exert considerable influence on elections there. Voters, too, usually cast their ballots for a candidate coming from their own tribe. In individual countries tribal chiefs are included in government bodies. The role of citizens, particularly women, in politics the Arab world continues to be regulated to a large extent by Islam. This is also true of socialist-oriented Arab countries. However, the main tendency in these countries, is the growing role of elements representing actually the shoots of the socialist political system (the establishment of people's councils, restriction of the political right of exploiters, etc.).

The common features of the political systems of developing countries described above reflect predominantly their outward aspects. In reality, however, political insitutions and principles which are similar in form are designed to meet the interests of different social and class forces and aimed at building either capitalist society or the prerequisites of socialism. That is why it takes an analysis of the social contents of the political systems of those countries to gain a thorough understanding of their nature. Such an analysis makes it possible to demonstrate the basic difference between the two diametrically opposite political systems which is rooted in the character of political power, and to identify a class (or classes) exercising state power in countries with different socio-political orientations.

Political Systems in Capitalist-Oriented Countries

The central institution of the political system in a capitalist-oriented country is the state. States differ from one

another from the point of view of their class character and form, and four groups of states can be identified:

1. Countries ruled by the national bourgeoisie (e.g., India, Tunisia). Methods of class domination in these countries, as a rule, have certain bourgeois-democratic features (such as the multiparty system and the conception of the separation of powers).

2. Countries ruled by an alliance of exploiting classes, usually the bourgeoisie and landowners (Indonesia, Morocco, Jordan and others). The political domination of the reactionary forces in them tends to become authoritarian (e.g., the ban on the Communist Party in Indonesia).

3. Countries ruled entirely or predominantly by the feudal lords (such as Saudi Arabia and the Persian Gulf states). The political systems of those states are more often than not downright reactionary. Even the form of government in most of them still is absolute monarchy, under which elective government institutions are non-existent and all the political parties banned.

4. Countries in which the formation of classes has not been completed and which are ruled by an intermediate social group which can be characterised as pro-bourgeois autocracy (individual countries of Tropical Africa). Political systems in them also are reactionary.

The form of government in most capitalist-oriented states outwardly resembles the presidency. However, the head of state in those countries often remains in his post for life, and elective government bodies exist only on paper, if at all. That is why such a republic actually has no republican institutions. Monarchies in the countries of this group also have specific features. For instance, a great role in the political system of a number of Arab countries, such as Saudi Arabia and the Gulf states, is played not only by the monarch, who exercises broad powers, but also by the family council whose advice the head of state seeks in deciding

major political issues.

Generally speaking, the political systems of capitalist-oriented countries are characterised by the vast importance of the subjective factor, by the special role of a political leader who in the republican form of government is concurrently the head of the only (or ruling) political party, the president (sometimes also the prime minister, and, finally, the mouthpiece and often founder of official ideology. A specific form of consolidating the power of the leader in certain African countries is the use of the titles of tribal chiefs. In Nigeria, for instance, almost all politicians of note bear the titles of chiefs of different tribes. In this way the head of state becomes the kingpin of the state machinery and the political system as a whole, while the role of parliament and other government institutions, parties and social organisations is diminished considerably.

Political parties play an important role in the political systems of many capitalist-oriented countries. The party systems differ from one another. There are multi-party systems in a number of countries, such as India and Senegal. However, they are different from such systems in developed capitalist countries. As the authorities frown upon the multi-party system, it can be allowed to exist but is denied an effective role in politics.

The one-party system is to be found in many capitalist-oriented countries, particularly in Africa. As a rule, it is formalised in law, with all the other parties, with the exception of the ruling party of the dominant class of exploiters, being forbidden. The one-party system is usually associated with the authoritarian pro-bourgeois regimes, which prohibit any opposition and strangle the other parties, particularly parties of the working class. The artificial fostering of the one-party system in these conditions is a reactionary development. We should distinguish, however, between the de jure and de facto one-party system, because in many capitalist-oriented countries other parties continue to function illegally.

The dominant classes in a number of countries belonging to this group have not established their political parties

(Saudi Arabia, the Gulf states, etc.). Some of them have no parties altogether, while in others progressive political parties went underground.

The political regimes of capitalist-oriented countries also differ from one another. A few of them formally have bourgeois-democratic regimes or have some of its institutions (e.g., India, Malaysia, Tunisia and Morocco). Bourgeois democratic rights and freedoms are written into law and partially translated into practice in them, different political parties (including, sometimes, even communist parties) exist and elections are held to the supreme and local bodies of government. But such regimes are rare in countries belonging to this group. The dominance of the ruling classes in most of them tends to become authoritarian, and even if the existence of many parties is allowed, only the parties of the exploiters are legalised, while the progressive parties are legally banned. Parliaments continue to be elective but representatives of working people are actually kept away from the highest legislative bodies. Totalitarian political regimes emerge in individual countries under which even formal elections are not held and all political parties are banned, with the exception of the ruling one.

A special kind of the political regimes in capitalist-oriented countries is the military regime emerging as a consequence of a military coup d'etat. It is usually considered a transitory regime, although it can remain in power for years and even decades. Military regimes in those countries most often express the interests of the reactionary classes and strata. The constitution here is usually suspended or repealed, being replaced with decrees of the military authorities, the parliament is dissolved, governors are appointed to replace local bodies of self-government, and all the political parties and mass organisations are banned.

Political Systems in Socialist-Oriented Countries

Political systems in socialist-oriented countries are often outwardly similar to those in other developing

countries (there are such common features, for instance, as the one-party system, the concentration of state power in the

hands of the military at a certain stage of development, the conception of the separation of powers, the preservation of certain traditional institutions, principles and norms, etc.). The nature of the political system, the mode of its functioning and its goals are different, however. The main difference is that political power in those countries represents the interests of a broad alliance of the national democratic forces, predominantly the working people, rather than the exploiters, and that the actual levers of government are controlled by revolutionary democrats.

Unlike the capitalist-oriented countries, the socialist-oriented countries evolve the new conception of the role of the party in society. What is meant here is the vanguard revolutionary-democratic parties that are being formed in some of these countries. The constitutions of many of these countries record the leading role of such a party. For instance, under Art. 3 of the 1978 Constitution of the People's Democratic Republic of Yemen "the Socialist Party of Yemen, equipped with the theory of scientific socialism, is the leading and guiding force of society and the state. It is the party that defines general prospects for the development of society and the domestic and foreign policies of the state". Allegiance to the theory of scientific socialism and even Marxism-Leninism is proclaimed in the constitutions and programmatic party documents of a number of other countries and parties (e.g., in the Congo, Benin).

The leading role of the vanguard party is seen in the fact that it lays down guidelines for the development of the country as a whole, and defines the ways of building a new state machinery, law and the political system. For instance, the extraordinary congress of the Socialist Party of Yemen in 1980 approved the second five-year socio-economic development plan of the country and recommended that elective bodies of people's control be established. Earlier, in 1978, the Socialist Party of Yemen had formulated at its first congress recommendations on revising the constitution, subsequently endorsed by the Supreme People's Council. The role of the party as the leader of society and the state is also manifest in the exercise by it of certain functions of party control.

Under the Rules of the Socialist Party of Yemen, primary party organisations at industrial plants and in offices have the right to control the activities of the management. Cadre policy, that is, the selection of personnel and their assignment to certain jobs depending on their political qualities and efficiency, is an important duty of the vanguard party. In Algeria, for instance, candidates for election to local bodies of government are nominated by organisations of the National Liberation Front. In addition, the Algerian Constitution of 1976 stipulates that candidates to the presidency and deputies to the National People's Assembly can only be nominated by the party.

The conception of "Party supremacy" is being developed in certain countries, such as Guinea and Tanzania. Under that conception the party is assigned the role of political power, while the state is only considered its technical tool. As a result, the party is often vested with the functions of government bodies and the party apparatus and the state machinery merge (for instance, local party organisations exercise administrative and judicial powers). However, in many countries this inadequate understanding of the leading role of the party with regard to government bodies is being gradually overcome. Art. 101 of the Algerian Constitution stipulates, for instance, that the party and state bodies act separately and use different means to attain their common goals and that their powers shall not overlap or become mixed up.

The state representing the interests of a broad alliance of progressive forces is a major tool of the national-democratic revolution in socialist-oriented countries. For instance, in accordance with Art. 1 of the Constitution of the People's Democratic Republic of Yemen, the state protects the interests of the workers, peasants, intellectuals, petty bourgeois and all the other working people seeking a transition to building socialism. It is a specific feature of this form of state power that it belongs not to a single class or alliance of homogeneous classes (only exploiters or only the working people), but to an alliance of different, sometimes even conflicting classes and social groups. The social base of that power is very broad, because it embraces the vast majority of the population.

primarily the working people, with the exception of a handful of exploiters and reactionary elements. Many legislative acts and policy documents in a number of countries stress that the leading role of the working class and other working people is constantly growing in this national-democratic alliance. However, since the proletariat is yet immature, actual government is exercised by revolutionary democrats who come for the most part from intermediate social strata and represent the interests of a broad national-democratic alliance. The forms of socialist-oriented states are quite diverse, and three major kinds can be identified here. The first is characterised by the central component of the state machinery, i.e. the elective Supreme People's Council, which exercises legislative functions and forms the government and a permanent body, like the presidium, which are accountable to it. There is a system of elective people's councils at all levels, to which the administrative bodies are accountable. Another specific feature of this form of government is the exercise of the functions of the head of state by a collective body, such as the Presidium of the Supreme People's Council, the State Council, etc.

The form of government in most socialist-oriented countries, among them Syria, Algeria, is characterised by the fact that the main element of the state machinery is the President, who appoints the government, formulates and implements state policies, and actually supervises the activities of the supreme legislative body. In addition, the head of state has certain legislative powers and the right to dissolve the parliament. The government is actually accountable to the president, who is elected in a general election at the party's recommendation.

The forms and methods of the exercise of state power in this group of countries are characterised by the development of democracy for the working people. Sometimes this is recorded in law. For instance, under the Syrian Constitution, workers and peasants must constitute at least one half of all deputies to the Supreme People's Council. In Algeria, the working people must control at least two-thirds of seats in

local people's councils. At the same time the political rights of the exploiters are restricted in a number of countries. Under the election law in the People's Democratic Republic of Yemen, the counter-revolutionary elements may be stripped of the right to elect and be elected.

By and large, the political systems in socialist-oriented countries are aimed at completing the national-democratic revolutions and creating objective and subjective conditions for a subsequent transition to building socialism through a number of intermediate stages. Some of the countries under review, such as the People's Democratic Republic of Yemen, are already raising the question of the gradual development of the national-democratic state power into the power of people's democracy, which some time in the future will assume the functions of the dictatorship of the proletariat.

6. The Development of Political Systems in Latin American Countries

Formation of Statehood

The principles of bourgeois statehood were proclaimed and constitutionally recorded in Latin American countries after the 1810-1825 War of Independence. But the actual government mechanism fell short of these principles. Power was wielded for decades by a small oligarchy of moneybags and landowners, who relied on the army for the performance of police functions. The Catholic Church carried out ideological functions in that system, and the ruling elite invoked authoritarian methods of government and resorted to police control.

As a result the politics in Latin American countries are still characterised by the following features.

First, the army plays a special role in the political system. Its exclusive position has been fixed in the constitutions of many Latin American countries and is reflected in official political and legal doctrines, in which the army is regarded as the guarantee of the constitutional form of government and law and order. The Latin American army is structured so as to enable the military command to exercise political power and even administrative functions. Army

methods in civil administration are commonplace and the military occupy many posts of responsibility. The army was for a long time supplying most presidents, and power often changed hands as a result of plots and military coups. The Latin American countries have seen 535 military coups d'etat during 150 years of their independence, and the number of aborted plots and mutinies is in the thousands. The military keep an especially tight hold on the Caribbean countries. The Dominican Republic has been ruled by military dictatorships for a total of 100 years, Haiti 145 years, El Salvador 80 years and Guatemala 62 years. In Ecuador only one president stayed in office throughout the constitutional four-year term in this century.

Second, the political leader is playing particularly important role in the political system. The autocratic character of government in Latin America is reflected in the purely Latin American phenomenon of "caudillo".

One characteristic feature of caudillism is the absence of a clear-cut political programme and a visibly organised political grouping (either ruling or rival party), and disdain for legal forms of power struggle and for legality in the exercise of power. It amounts to personification of political power and the concentration of government authority and military and political leadership in the hands of one man.

The caudillo as the head of nation and state stands in opposition to representative institutions and political parties. Any opposition to him is ruthlessly suppressed.

Caudillism was reflected both in the puppet regimes backed by US monopolies (the regimes of Trujillo, Duvalier, Somoza and Batista), and in the bourgeois nationalistic movements of the 30s-40s /the "new state" (Estado Nôvo) of Vargas in Brazil and the Peronist state in Argentina/. Caudillism is manifest in certain presidential regimes, with the outgoing president actually picking up his successor, who is also elected leader of the ruling party. This practice accounts for the personification of power.

Third, coercive and bureaucratic methods of setting up governmental institutions in Latin American countries prevail over democratic ones. The mass of the people in most Latin

American countries have no experience in making use of avowed bourgeois-democratic freedoms and institutions, while the ruling classes prefer brute force to political manœuvring.

Political parties emerged as a result of bourgeois-democratic evolution and the struggle of the mass of people. But they have not as yet evolved into an effective political mechanism in most countries. As a result, there have emerged "restricted" party systems, controlled by the army and government bureaucracy. The degree of control varies. In some countries parties are phoney. In some Latin American countries a controlled two-party system, patterned on the US system, is introduced.

Even in those countries where the mechanism of bourgeois democracy was established in the first half of the 20th century and gained ground in traditional structures it failed the test of the social crisis and proved fragile and vulnerable. The multi-party systems that emerged in Chile, Uruguay and Costa Rica seemed similar to models of Western European bourgeois democracy. The working class had its own legal parties, and representatives in legislatures. But in Uruguay the parliamentary system was destroyed in 1973 by the coup d'etat engineered by pro-imperialist forces, bent on establishing a totalitarian political structure. The military-fascist coup in Chile halted the revolutionary process and, moreover, abrogated constitutional legality and trampled underfoot the democratic rights won by the Chilean people in many years of uphill struggle against the oligarchy.

The following political regimes can be identified in Latin America:

1. Regimes of limited

bourgeois democracy. Under this regime bourgeois-democratic freedoms are written into law and partially ensured in practice and the political and legal structures allow different parties, sometimes even communist parties, to function. Elections have a substantial role to play in the formation of government bodies: the main ones are either elected by the citizenry or formed by parliament. The principle of the separation of powers is formally recognised.

Political Regimes

These provisions, however, are often disregarded and the freedom of action of working-class parties and trade unions restricted. The Communists are persecuted, worker strikes are suppressed with the use of armed force, and laws are actually promulgated by the government.

2. The political dominance of the alliance of the bourgeoisie and landowners often involves violations of the principles of bourgeois democracy.

a) the oligarchic regime in Paraguay is a military-police dictatorship protecting the interests of the military clique, major landowners, industrialists and businessmen connected with foreign monopolies, primarily US corporations. The attributes of the bourgeois republic have been formally retained. The socio-political basis of this regime is national monopoly or big financial capital.

b) the constitutional-authoritarian regime, under which the constitution remains in force, but certain political parties are banned and, moreover, special laws are passed to legalise governmental control over the actions of legal parties. The parliament is retained but it is often formed on a corporate basis and its activities are a mere formality. The executive branch of government is dominant and the key posts are held by the president.

c) the military regime established as a result of a military coup. It is usually considered transitory but this transition can take years. Under such regimes the army can act as a national revolutionary force, as the mailed fist of counter-revolutionary alternative, and as a conservative force, a tool of preserving the existing system.

Parties and Other Political Institutions

The political systems of Latin American countries are going through an active crisis, manifested in ideological

turmoil in the army and the religious circles, in the breakdown of traditional conservative and bourgeois-reformist parties and the emergence of new, mass political movements. Patriotic and democratic tendencies began to gain ground in the armed forces of Latin American countries and they no longer give unconditional support to the ruling upper crust.

The pro-imperialist oligarchy of landowners and financiers have lost its erstwhile positions of dominance in many states. Several social groups and, accordingly, several political movements lay claim to supremacy in society. Different party and social groups, seeking power in order to develop new political structures, are clashing in the field of politics. The political activity of the urban middle strata, progressive intellectuals, students, certain groups of government employees are growing, and new detachments of the working class and the peasantry and marginal groups of the urban population are joining in political struggle. As the political activity of the mass of the population grows, new parties emerge.

The following main political parties can be identified in Latin America:

1. The conservative camp. The extreme right-wing forces represent traditional, or historical parties, which appeared at the beginning or in the middle of last century as the mouthpieces of large landowners and the Catholic hierarchy (conservative) and commercial and industrial bourgeoisie (liberal). There was a time when these parties were at loggerheads, vying for power to the point of civil wars. But as the bourgeois and landowners' oligarchies took shape, contradictions between them were smoothed out to such an extent that today it is difficult to tell a conservative from a liberal, while their parties often merge. During their stay in power (the second half of the 19th and the early 20th centuries) the conservatives and the liberals demonstrated their utmost impotence and gradually lost the support of both the university and Catholic intellectuals and their mass social base, the downtrodden and oppressed peasantry.

The neo-fascist tendencies are growing in the right-wing camp, although political organisations of neo-fascists have so far been set up only in a handful of countries. For the most part they are represented by non-party organisations and groups, such as armed fascist gangs in Chile, semi-governmental organisations in Guatemala and other Central American republics and army clubs in Brazil.

A special group of the right-wing forces is represented by the movements rallying around former dictators, who speculate for their purposes on the crisis of the traditional political system and who seek support among marginal urban strata and declassed elements.

2. Reformist parties. There are quite a few reformist parties in Latin America, including, first and foremost, the "people's" and "democratic-revolutionary" parties which emerged during the 1930s and 1940s and which still retain their mass base. Speaking on behalf of the "middle class", the leaders of those parties proclaim high-sounding programmes of social reforms, protection of the democratic freedoms, control over foreign capital and government regulation of the economy. Since the second half of the 1950s they have been governing Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Venezuela, the Dominican Republic, Costa Rica and Peru and for the most part moved dramatically to the right. In Mexico, the reformist Institutional Revolutionary Party has consolidated its hold of power and has for over 40 years now been ensuring the development of the country towards the establishment of state-monopoly structures.

Most of the Christian Democratic parties in Latin America (e.g., in Chile, Costa Rica, Peru) and the Social-Christian Party of Venezuela advocate "neo-capitalist" reforms, the large-scale attraction of foreign capital, predominantly through inter-governmental channels, Latin American integration and neutralism in foreign policy. These parties retain their mass base.

The left-wing movement is gaining momentum among the Christian Democrats. It is represented both by independent political organisations and groups which have banished right-wing centrist elements from their leadership (El Salvador) or broken off with reformist and Democratic Christian parties (the Left Christian Movement in Chile and left-wing Catholic groups in Brazil, Argentina and Columbia), and by "rebel" groups within these parties in Peru, Uruguay, Argentina, Venezuela and Columbia. They are supported by a considerable portion of Catholic workers, progressive intellectuals, the lower clergy and students. The left-wing Catholics advo-

cate revolutionary change in society, consistent anti-imperialist policy, are opposed to capitalism and exploitation, and for this reason actually belong to the revolutionary camp.

3. Revolutionary parties. The interests of the more consistent revolutionary forces in Latin America are expressed by the communist parties, which have long-standing militant traditions. Some of the communist parties have become mass-scale national parties while others, despite their small numerical strength, constitute an important factor of politics in their countries.

Socialist parties constitute another detachment of the left-wing forces. As a consequence of divisions between the right-wing and left-wing elements in traditional socialist parties and the ascent of the leftist leadership in most of them, fresh prospects for cooperation between these parties and the Communists opened up in the late 1950s.

Ultra-leftist parties and groupings, which are quite numerous in Latin American countries, present the revolutionary alternative of development in inadequate, often utopian forms. These groupings consist of students, intellectuals and a small number of workers. The ultra-leftists underestimate the tasks of legal struggle and organisation. Ideologically, they sometimes are apt to embrace anti-communism.

The Communists are looking perseveringly for attracting "left-wing revolutionaries" as allies, while criticising their errors from positions of principle. They attach priority to the organisation of mass-scale movements in their countries and to training a political army of the revolution. In so doing, they, relying on the existing experience of struggle, admit that, although the working class is the most revolutionary class, at the start of the liberation movement the leading role may be assumed by other social groups acting from revolutionary positions. The experience of peoples of the continent shows that in course of anti-imperialist and democratic struggle for liberation new political movements and parties of revolutionary-democratic type could born. Sandino National Liberation Front is a picturesque example. This example demonstrates that with the help of skillful strategy and tactic the revolutionary advance-guard is able to gain

the hegemonic role and to lead the wide mass of population. The primary programme aim of SNLP is creation of a regime of true justice and social progress and its activity after Somoza tyranny was overthrown was directed to formation of the political structure which could secure the achievement of this aim.

Impact of Cuban Experience

The Cuban revolution has seen complex political processes. The bourgeois military-bureaucratic machinery

in Cuba was dismantled for the most part during the democratic stage of the revolution.

The state of revolutionary democracy in Cuba constituted direct preparations for the establishment of a proletarian state. Transition from the revolutionary-democratic dictatorship to the dictatorship of the proletariat had been generally completed by the end of 1960. By that time the foundations of the state machinery of a new type had been laid as well. The Cuban revolution rejected as useless in building the new state machinery the principles of bourgeois parliamentarism. The new state machinery was first built through the establishment of non-elective revolutionary administration, which worked in close contact with mass organisations. Direct democracy also had an important role to play in the functioning of the revolutionary state during the early years of the people's rule.

As the Cuban revolution reached maturity, the main content of state development became the extension of socialist democracy and the encouragement of representative bodies of government. In 1963, the revolutionary government of Cuba established a new political-administrative division, with an additional intermediary link, the district, introduced between the province and the municipia. Members of district and municipal organisations began to be elected by open ballot with subsequent endorsement by higher party organs. The voting took place at factories, people's estates and farming associations with one delegate elected from every 100 people. Deputies to regional and municipal councils were members of numerous commissions concerned with public educa-

tion, health care, road building, etc. These bodies of government paved the way to more mature forms of socialist statehood.

The 1970s saw more energetic activities to promote socialist legality. Revolutionary legal acts on the organisation of the judicial system, on criminal, civil and administrative court procedures, and the family code were drawn up, discussed and approved.

The development of socialist democracy was given a strong impetus by the establishment of experimental bodies of people's government through democratic elections held in the Matanzas province in 1974. These bodies functioned in Matanzas from September 1974 to October 1976, and their experience was used in holding general elections in October-November 1976.

The First Congress of the Communist Party of Cuba in December 1975 became a landmark in the development of socialist democracy. A new constitution of the Republic of Cuba, the first socialist constitution in the Western Hemisphere, was put up for a referendum by the Congress's decision, approved by the overwhelming majority vote and entered into force on February 24, 1976.

The new constitution was drafted on the basis of general conclusions drawn from Cuba's own experience and also from the experience of the peoples who have embarked on the road of building socialism much earlier.

The constitution and the laws passed on its basis provide for the establishment of bodies of people's power all over the country. Elections to the primary organs of people's power, municipal assemblies, are universal, direct and equal (one man - one vote) by secret ballot. The world's lowest voting age was established in Cuba, 16 years. Citizens of that age can also be elected to municipal and provincial assemblies, and to the National Assembly upon reaching 18.

Deputies are nominated at the place of their residence by primary territorial communities, collectives of citizens. Voters also cast their ballots at their place of residence. Not more than one candidate is nominated by every election district. Candidates for deputy to the provincial assemblies of people's power and to the National Assembly of People's

Power are nominated by commissions consisting of representatives of political and mass organisations. Members of these commissions are appointed by the municipality leadership under the chairmanship of the Communist Party's representative and approved by deputies to the municipality.

The principle of having more than one candidate per seat is observed at every level during the elections, and votes are counted publicly.

The president of the municipal executive committee automatically becomes a deputy to the respective provincial assembly. All the other vacancies allotted to the municipia for representation in the provincial assembly are filled by secret ballot taken at the municipal assembly.

Municipal assemblies also elect deputies to the National Assembly of People's Power, which in its turn elects the State Council of the Republic.

Deputies regularly report to their constituents, and can be recalled by their decision. Deputies do not draw salaries but continue to hold their jobs while the state compensates them for the expenses incurred by them in discharging their duties as deputy.

The Communist Party of Cuba plays the leading role in Cuban socialist society. The assumption by the Communist Party of the leading role in the socialist political system in Cuba had certain specific features.

During the democratic stage of the revolution the main guiding force of the political organisation of society was the alliance of the revolutionary organisations July 26th Movement, Revolutionary Directorate and the Popular Socialist Party. However, as the tasks facing the revolution grew more complex, the need for a single Marxist-Leninist party became obvious. Processes of differentiation were taking place among the revolutionary democrats and the more consistent of them began to go over to the positions of the proletariat. Fidel Castro, the leader of the revolution, played an outstanding role in the transition of the revolutionary democrats to the class positions of the working class. The ideological evolution of the revolutionary democrats to Marxism-Leninism laid a solid foundation for the alliance of left-wing forces, creat-

ing the basis for their organisational unification.

The organisational merger of the People's Socialist Party, the July 26th Movement and the Revolutionary Directorate in the United Revolutionary Organisations on the basis of Marxism-Leninism began in the middle of 1961.

The development of the Cuban revolution involved quite a few difficulties. The United Revolutionary Organisations were not yet a party in the full sense of the word but a transitory political entity the aim of which was to prepare the ground for the establishment of a Marxist-Leninist party. The restructuring of the URO and the establishment of a United Party of the Socialist Revolution began as early as 1962, when initial party cells were set up. In October 1965, the decision was taken to name the emergent party the Communist Party. During that time the leading bodies of the Party were being formed.

The Party was being formed under difficult conditions, when the main task of the Cuban revolution was "to survive". Certain mistakes were made in that situation and the process of establishment dragged on. During the past few years, however, the Cuban Communists have done a great deal to improve the forms and methods of their activity and the organisational structure of the Party, to raise the ideological and political standards of its members and to strengthen contacts with the mass of the population.

In August 1970, the Politbureau of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Cuba passed a decision on dividing the functions of party and government bodies. This division became even more clear-cut following the reorganisation of the Central Committee in 1973. A new structure was evolved for the entire party apparatus at the national, provincial, district and municipal levels and also in the workers' centres.

The First Congress of the Communist Party of Cuba took measures further to consolidate the party on the principles of Marxism-Leninism. The Rules and the Programmatic Platform of the Communist Party of Cuba, written in the spirit of Marxism-Leninism were approved. The Second Congress of the Communist Party of Cuba drew much attention to scientific

development of Cuban society perspectives and defined the tasks of the party in building socialism. The congress became a notable event not only in the country's life, but in communist, labour and national liberation movement as a whole. 150 delegations and observers of communist and labour parties, other progressive parties and national liberation movements took part in its session.

x x x

Two Lines of Political Development

A comparative analysis of the tendencies of present-day political systems makes it possible to draw conclusions on the general direction of development of political systems in our epoch.

The most salient feature characterising the 20th century is the emergence and development of new types of political systems and diverse political regimes as a result of socialist and national liberation revolutions. This process has swept most of mankind in Europe and Asia, Africa and Latin America.

The period of the most active political reorganisation of society in the past was ushered in by the bourgeois revolutions of the 18th and 19th centuries. That process was limited for the most part to Europe and the United States of America. Having born bourgeois statehood and bourgeois parliamentary democracy, those revolutions laid the foundations of those political structures which have survived to this day in a modified form in developed capitalist countries. Despite the great historical importance of parliamentarism, however, the creative political processes of the period of the bourgeois revolutions are dwarfed by the gigantic scale, profundity and diversity of the political forms brought to life by the socialist and national liberation revolutions in the present epoch.

World politics today are characterised first and foremost by the emergence, consolidation and development of socialist states. The political systems of socialist countries, given all the diversity of specific forms of government and state structure, political regimes and political dynamics, cultures and traditions, constitute an example of the exercise

of power by the working class and the working people as a whole. These countries are accumulating valuable experience of the formation of the political organisation of a new type, led by the communist and workers' parties and embracing diverse democratic forms of involving the mass of the people in government.

The cumulative experience of socialist countries is exerting an ever greater influence on all the political relations in the present epoch. It sets an example for advanced workers, for politically awakened working people in capitalist countries in their struggle for genuine democracy and social progress. This experience is used extensively in many countries which have recently shaken off the fatters of colonial and semi-colonial dependence. The domestic and foreign policies of socialist countries are exerting an ever greater influence on world politics.

The emergence and development of new political systems in Asian, African and Latin American countries as a consequence of national liberation revolutions has great historic importance. The political systems that are taking shape in these countries are accumulating new, sometimes quite peculiar experience, which also constitutes one of the more remarkable characteristics of today's world development.

Socialist-oriented developing countries going through the stage of national-democratic revolutions carry out restrictions of capitalist property and create public sectors in the economy. Feudal relationships are being eradicated and cooperation encouraged in agriculture. In the international scene they are promoting and extending relations with socialist countries, whose assistance and support helps them to advance their revolutions.

The alignment of class forces is changing in socialist-oriented countries, the working class is emerging and gaining maturity, and forming an alliance with the peasantry.

The socialist-oriented states have a number of characteristics distinguishing them from those developing countries which have chosen the capitalist road. Those countries, as a rule, are governed by alliances of social forces, including the working class, the peasantry, the urban petty bourgeoisie.

oisie and the progressive intelligentsia. Political leadership is usually exercised by the revolutionary democrats. From the point of view of its nature, the socialist-oriented state during the stage of national democratic revolution is the revolutionary-democratic dictatorship of the people. As the revolution progresses, the role of the working class in politics is bound to grow steadily.¹

The nature of the socialist-oriented states and the main tasks tackled by them determine the character of their functions. The domestic functions exercised by those states include the suppression of the classes and social groups which are hostile to the revolution, the organisation of the economy, the eradication of clan and tribal prejudices and the vestiges of colonial mentality, and also the promotion of cultural and educational activities. The external functions are the defence of the country, struggle against imperialism and neo-colonialism, and the extension of friendship and cooperation with socialist and developing states.

Statehood in socialist-oriented countries has no room for the monarchic form of government. The political basis of the state is represented by the government bodies elected democratically. For instance, councils in the People's Democratic Republic of Yemen are elected by universal, direct and equal suffrage.

The political systems of socialist-oriented countries are evolving towards democratisation. Some of them are governed by alliances of parties, others by single political organisations. There are in some of these countries mass organisations (fronts), through which the mass of the popula-

¹. In the People's Democratic Republic of Yemen, for instance, during the emergence of the national state (1967-1969) power belonged to the mass of the urban and rural working people, and intellectuals and army officers participated in its exercise. The leading political force was the urban petty bourgeoisie. Between 1969 and 1972, the petty bourgeoisie lost its monopoly of leadership, which began to switch to workers, hired farmhands and the poor and middle peasants. (See Programme of the Political Organisation of the National Front at the State of the National-Democratic Revolution. Part II. Special Bulletin of the Institute of Oriental Studies of the USSR Academy of Sciences, No. 1, 1973).

tion are involved in the political life.

Having learned at first hand that socialism can only be built on the basis of Marxism-Leninism, a number of countries, including Angola, Congo, the PDRY and Mozambique, have stated their intention to build socialism on a scientific basis. The number of such countries is constantly growing. Vanguard parties have been established or are going to be formed in some of them (Mozambique, Angola, the Congo, PDRY and Ethiopia) to direct the building of a new society.

The activities of socialist-oriented states are pronouncedly anti-capitalist and democratic. They are carrying out a wide range of social and political measures in the interests of the mass of the working people. Today they face complex tasks and many difficulties on the way to socialist society. Lenin warned on more than one occasion that the road to socialism "will never be straight, it will be incredibly involved."¹

However, advancing on the road of progress and struggling for complete freedom from imperialist exploitation and for the right to be masters of their destinies, the developing countries rely on comprehensive support and selfless friendly assistance of the Soviet Union and other socialist countries.

Political relations taking shape within the framework of the system of developing countries are exerting an ever greater influence on the entire system of political relations in the present-day world.

Along with the new, revolutionary experience of state development, the present epoch sees a certain modification of the traditional political systems in the developed capitalist countries of the West. This modification is taking place first and foremost under the influence of internal factors, such as class struggle and the specific forms of state-monopoly capitalism. At the same time the socialist world and, to a degree, the developing countries are exerting

1. V.I. Lenin, Collected Works, Vol. 27, p. 130.

an ever greater influence on the political awareness and particularly on the ideology of the embattled mass of the people.

Bourgeois parliamentarism, just as the bourgeois political system as a whole, is gripped by a permanent crisis. The bourgeois states find it particularly excruciating to adapt themselves to a changed system of international relations evolving under the mighty impact of the world socialist community and the countries which have emerged from colonial and semi-colonial dependence, working together for radical changes in the traditional system of international relations dating back to the epoch of the unchallenged dominance of capitalism and imperialism, for the triumph of the principles of peace and peaceful coexistence, for complete equality between states and for mutually-beneficial cooperation. The attempts to adapt the outdated mechanisms and principles of bourgeois democracy to the demands of our time result in peculiar disfigurement of the political systems of capitalism, torn apart by internal strife, in the steady decline of the role of traditional institutions, first and foremost parliaments, in the instability of governments, and in the growing contradictions between domestic and foreign policies.

Chapter V

THE SOCIAL REVOLUTION

Replacement of socio-economic formations always represents a fundamental qualitative leap transforming all the aspects of social life, primarily its basis and superstructure. For that very reason, such leaps are called social revolutions. Their role in history and the laws of their origination and development are studied by historical materialism.

To master the science of revolution is an essential prerequisite for successful revolutionary activity of the party of the working class. This science was developed by the founders of Marxism-Leninism on the basis of profound analysis of the history of the revolutionary movement and generalisation of the practice of the proletariat's class struggle. It has been creatively developed in the theoretical documents of the international communist movement, and is continually generalised by the new historical experience of the present-day revolutionary process.

What is a social revolution, and what are its principal historical types? What are the laws of social revolution? And what are the specific of socialist revolution?

1. Revolution and Its Role in Social Development

The Concept of Social Revolution

The concept of social revolution is essentially many-sided. In very general terms, the social revolution

is a method for resolving the conflict between productive forces and obsolete production relations which deter their development, and subsequently in the entire political superstructure, a method for transition from an outdated socio-economic formation to a more progressive one. This is, in fact, a fundamental qualitative turn in the entire socio-economic structure of society. In the preface to his A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy, Marx showed

how the contradiction between the two aspects of the mode of production leads to production relations transforming from forms of development of productive forces into their fetters. He wrote: "Then begins an era of social revolution. The changes in the economic foundation lead sooner or later to the transformation of the whole immense superstructure. In studying such transformations it is always necessary to distinguish between the material transformation of the economic conditions of production, which can be determined with the precision of natural science, and the legal, political, religious, artistic or philosophic -- in short, ideological form in which men become conscious of this conflict and fight it out."¹

As a form of social development, the social revolution is opposite to social evolution, which signifies continuous gradual change in the various aspects of social life within the same socio-economic formation.

Marxist-Leninist theory attaches important significance to the laws of social revolution. In antagonistic societies, evolution inevitably leads to aggravation of contradictions in the mode of production, to increasing need in social revolution. Now, why cannot these contradictions be resolved evolutionally? Because they touch the essence of production relations, on the basis of which evolutional changes occur. However, these relations cannot be replaced by others evolutionally, for they are safeguarded by the ruling classes, by the political and ideological superstructure of the old basis. A resolution of the conflict between productive forces and production relations requires, therefore, fundamental breaking the entire socio-economic and political system, i.e. social revolution.

Despite the fact that they are extreme opposites, revolution and evolution are interconnected. Evolutional changes within the framework of antagonistic societies create premises for revolutions. On the other hand, the latter, in eliminating the outdated system of production relations

1. K. Marx, A contribution to the Critique of Political Economy, Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1977, p. 21.

and its corresponding superstructure, opens the way for evolution within the framework of the new socio-economic formation.

From the definition given in the preface to Marx's A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy it is clear that in the concept of social revolution Marx also included the form of struggle used by people to resolve the conflict within the mode of production. Under this angle, the social revolution comes out as a method of social transformations aimed at fundamentally changing the very foundations of the existing system.

As a method of historical activity, revolution is opposite to reform, which is aimed at achieving partial changes within the framework of a given system. Marxism-Leninism does not deny the significance of reforms, but regards them in connection with the prospects of a revolution. All historical experience proves that reforms represent a subsidiary product of the revolutionary struggle of the masses. Even in cases when reforms are not direct results of mass actions by the working people, they are carried on by the ruling classes under the pressure of the popular masses so as not to allow a revolutionary explosion.

With regard to social reforms, Marxists wage a struggle on two fronts. On the one hand, they resolutely expose reformism, which dissolves revolution in reforms, being guided by the formula "movement is everything, and the ultimate goal is nothing". On the other hand, they come out against leftist and anarchist revolutionism, which puts up an insurmountable barrier between reforms and revolution, and behind revolutionary phraseology about ultimate goals loses real foundation for advancing towards those goals.

The Marxist dialectical approach to the relationship between reforms and revolution was clearly formulated by Lenin, who wrote: "The concept 'reform', is undoubtedly the opposite of the concept 'revolution'. Failure to remember this contrast, failure to remember the line that divides

these two concepts, constantly leads to very serious mistakes in all historical discussions. But this contrast is not something absolute, this line is not something dead, but alive and changing, and one must be able to define it in each particular case."¹ The chief target that Marxists-Leninists set for themselves is to turn reforms into strongpoints in the struggle for fundamental remaking of society, for revolution.

In Marxist literature, the concept of revolution is regarded both in a broad and narrow sense. In the very broad sense, social revolution encompasses the entire process of transition from the lower socio-economic formation to the higher one. In this sense, revolution continues over a whole historical epoch to include numerous social and political movements. As elements of social revolution, these movements objectively serve the task of destroying the old system and to prepare the ground for establishing a new system. The epoch of social revolution involves an acute class struggle, in which victories of revolutionary classes alternate with temporary defeats, advances alternate with rolls back, and periods of offensives with periods of partial restoration, political compromises, and new offensives. The social revolution continues until the new socio-economic formation is established once and for all in the principal countries involved in world history.

In a narrower sense, the social revolution implies a transition to a more progressive social system within one country. For instance, the bourgeois revolution in France embraced a period from 1789 to 1791. The transition from capitalism to socialism in Russia began in October 1917 to culminate in the mid-thirties when a socialist society had been built in the USSR.

Finally, in a still narrower and most widespread sense, the concept of revolution is used to designate a political upheaval, as a result of which the class essence of power comes to be replaced. Lenin noted: "The passing of state

1. V.I. Lenin, Collected Works, Vol. 17, pp. 115-116.

power from one class to another is the first, the principal, the basic sign of a revolution, both in the strictly scientific and in the practical political meaning of that term.¹ In accordance with this criterion, we speak of the English bourgeois revolution of 1648, of the French bourgeois revolution of 1789, and of the Great October Socialist Revolution of 1917 in Russia.

The narrower definitions of social revolution do not contradict to the wider definition, but enter it as component parts. Indeed, the struggle for and winning of power by the foremost class is an essential and most important stage in any social revolution, understood in a broader sense as a transition from one social system to another. Social revolutions in individual countries also represent links of a single process of world historical importance, a process involving a transition from a lower socio-economic formation to a higher one. Noting this circumstance, Marx emphasised that the English and French bourgeois revolutions "reflected the needs of the world at that time rather than the needs of those parts of the world where they occurred, that is England and France".²

Role of Social Revolution

What then is the role of social revolutions in social development? This issue is a subject of acu-

te ideological struggle.

Bourgeois ideologists and reformists deny or belittle the progressive significance of social revolutions and distort their very essence. They reduce revolution to court coups d'etat. Conversely, others include in revolution essentially all changes in social life. In both cases, the objective is one, namely to emasculate from the concept of social revolution its essence as a means for achieving fundamental qualitative changes in the entire system of social relations. In our time, bourgeois ideologists and revisionists

1. V.I. Lenin, Collected Works, Vol. 24, p. 44.

2. K. Marx, F. Engels, Collected Works, Vol. 8, p. 161.

seek to dissolve social revolution in the scientific and technological revolution, which allegedly automatically resolves fundamental social problems to free capitalism from its intrinsic contradictions and class antagonisms.

Revolution involves in active political activity the broadest popular masses, which in quiet periods of history the ruling classes manage to debar from politics. In this connection, Lenin said: "At no other time are the mass of the people in a position to come forward so actively as creators of a new social order, as at a time of revolution. At such times the people are capable of performing miracles..."¹ For that very reason, the rates of social development in revolutionary periods become unusually quick, and the limits of the possible, as Lenin put it, a thousand-fold larger.

Historical Types of Social Revolutions

Social revolution is a historical category. It is connected with a

lengthy period of human history, beginning with the disintegration of the primitive-communal system and culminating with the currently occurring establishment of the communist socio-economic formation. The entire period has been full of acute class struggle and numerous social revolutions, multiform in essence and form. Their inevitability was caused by the fact that all the consecutively changing systems of production relations, starting with primitive-communal ones and ending with capitalist relations, had the hall-mark of historical narrow-mindedness and, sooner or later, entered into conflict with the development of productive forces, with the pressing needs of social progress. Marxist typology of social revolutions is essentially based on a distinct materialist criterion, namely the character of the objective tasks tackled by the revolution. The type of revolution depends on what kind of production relations it destroys, and to what socio-economic formation a transition is made. History knows of four such types of revolution.

1. V.I. Lenin, Collected Works, Vol. 9, p. 113.

The first type involves social revolution which destroyed the primitive-communal system to establish the slave-owner socio-economic formation. That was a profound revolution, which resulted in a fundamental upheaval in production relations; public ownership of the means of production was replaced by private ownership, and a class society and state emerged to take the place of clan organisation and communal self-government.

The progressive significance of the social revolution, whereby a transition from the primitive-communal formation to the slave-owning one was completed, was in that it broke the narrow framework of clan and tribal relationships, which had become an obstacle to development of production, division of labour, and growth of culture. As long as human labour afforded but a meagre surplus over the necessary means of subsistence, the outcome of revolution could be but one, namely the establishment of a system, with which progress would be achieved at the cost of enslavement of a vast majority of the population. In those conditions, this was a large step forward, opening the way to further growth of productive forces, division of labour into mental and manual, and development of science and art.

The second type involves a social revolution which secured a transition from the slave-owning socio-economic formation to feudalism. The deep source of this revolution was the fundamental contradiction of the slave-owning mode of production: the development of productive forces deep inside it encountered the limited form of production relations based on direct physical compulsion to labour of the mass of slaves.

Slaves were the mass social force that undermined the slave-owning society, and slave uprisings occurred throughout the whole history of that society. Slave actions were of a spontaneous nature and fulfilled purely destructive functions; in inflicting blows on the slave-owning system, they did not go beyond its framework. Another social force taking part in the struggle against the slave-owning system were free landholders, artisans, and the urban poor subjected to vari-

ous forms of exploitation and persecution. Not infrequently, they joined slave uprisings. Finally, a major force that overthrew the slave-owning system were the neighbouring barbarian tribes, whose invasions, leading to the collapse of the Roman Empire, cannot be conceived solely as an external factor. These tribes were within the sphere of slave-owning forms of exploitation; they were subjected to plunder, paid a tribute, and were a source for reinforcing the army of slaves.

Three closely intertwined streams, viz. slave uprisings, the movement of free plebs, and invasions by barbarian tribes, were, in effect, the principal forces of the anti-slave-owning revolution which cleared the way for the feudal socio-economic formation.

The third type was the bourgeois revolution which had overthrown the yoke of serfdom and the feudal system to establish the dominance of capitalism. This revolution was preceded by numerous uprisings of peasants, the main oppressed class in feudal society, a class subjected to cruel exploitation by feudal landlords. At times, peasant revolutionary actions assumed a national scope, e.g. the Jacquerie in France (1358), Wat Tyler's rebellion in Britain (1381), the Peasant War in Germany (1524-1525), and the peasant wars in Russia under the leadership of Ivan Bolotnikov (1606), Stepan Razin (1667-1671), and Emelian Pugachev (1773-1775). Yet, their spontaneity and poor organisation doomed these actions to defeat. To triumph they lacked a leading class that would be the bearer of a new mode of production. This class emerged on the political scene together with the rise of the capitalist structure within the bosom of the feudal system. The young bourgeoisie, along with the peasantry and plebeian urban strata, became the motive force of bourgeois revolutions.

In the wake of the bourgeoisie, the proletariat emerged on the political scene to take an active part in the revolutionary movement with its own demands. The role of the bourgeoisie as the leading revolutionary force began to decline. The bourgeoisie began to show increasing tendency towards a half-way, compromise outcome of the revolu-

tionary struggle, towards reaching an understanding with reactionary feudal lords at the expense of the working people.

The socialist revolution, which represents the fourth type of social revolution, puts an end to the last exploiter system - capitalism - to usher an era of the establishment of the communist socio-economic formation.

Such is the very general pattern of the main types of social revolution in human history. Naturally, in real life this is much more complex. The point is that socio-economic formations have never existed in a "pure" form. Hence, a social revolution, too, makes its way through a number of heterogeneous socio-economic relations which affect its essence and cause various deviations from the classical types of social revolutions. The uneven development of the economy and of class struggle in different countries determines the various aspects of their entry into revolutionary periods. Some revolutions remain incomplete, and this leaves open the question of what type they belong.

Multiformity of the Revolutionary Process

Within the framework of each type of social revolution, there are numerous different variations

connected with the concrete historical features of the revolutionary process in different countries and in different periods. The essence of a social revolution largely depends on the composition of its motive forces. For instance, bourgeois revolutions, depending on the scope of the mass of their participants, may be either popular or "uppermost". In popular revolutions, the masses, as Lenin noted, leave "on the entire course of the revolution an imprint of their own demands, their attempts to build in their own way a new society in place of the old society that was being destroyed".¹ In upheavals "at the top", certain bourgeois strata which

1. V.I. Lenin, Collected Works, Vol. 25, p. 421.

had emerged on the crest of the discontent with the old system succeed in debarring the masses from active participation in the revolutionary process. This was the case in the unfinished revolution of 1867-1868 in Japan, in the Young Turk Revolution of 1908, and in the Portuguese Revolution of 1910. The uppermost revolution is characterised by its half-way, incomplete, and compromise nature. The depth of revolutionary changes thus wholly depends on the specific weight of different classes and strata that take part in the revolution, on the extent of their socio-political maturity, and on their mutual relations.

All this results in that each of the basic types of social revolution is subdivided into a whole series of sub-types or transitional types. The era of bourgeois revolutions may serve as an example of this. It embraces several centuries, and it is natural that over such a lengthy historical period major changes took place in the social structure, and in the position and the alignment of various classes and strata. As a result, experience in the revolutionary struggle was accumulated, the lessons of preceding revolutions were learned, and the reactionary forces involved and the strategy and tactics of their counter-revolutionary actions also changed. Bourgeois revolutions also took the shape of spontaneous peasant wars and uprisings of urban "lower strata"; of broad movements that took on a religious tinge; and of strong national actions by an alliance of peasants, petty-bourgeois urban strata and the emerging proletariat under the leadership of the bourgeoisie and, at a later stage, of bourgeois-democratic revolutions, some of which were proletarian as regards leadership and methods of struggle, as it was in Russia in 1905-1907. A gradation of subtypes conditioned by these differences is clearly discerned within the framework of a bourgeois revolution. With the advent of capitalism into the imperialist stage of development, it becomes possible for the proletariat to win hegemony in a bourgeois-democratic revolution. This creates a new historical perspective for its development into a socialist revolution.

In the 19th century, the distinctive feature of bourgeois revolutions in Latin America was the fact that they were essentially national liberation in nature. Of paramount importance was the conflict between the requirements of productive forces, which needed a nationally independent framework for their development, and foreign domination accompanied by plunder of enslaved countries, by subjugation of their economic life to the objectives of this domination. The social foundation of these revolutions was the conflict between the interests of the leading social force in a conquered country and its people as a whole and those of the ruling classes of feudal-monarchist Spain. The alignment of class forces in the Latin American countries was very peculiar: the Creole leadership took the guidance of the liberation struggle into its hands. The victorious conclusion of the wars for independence in 1810-1826 led to political predominance of and even dominance by the aristocracy and landlords. In the further development of Latin American countries following these revolutions the role and significance of big landownership has increased in many regions.

In the era of proletarian social revolutions ushered in by the Great October Socialist Revolution of 1917 in Russia, the revolutionary processes are distinguished by a still greater diversity. Socialist revolutions have their distinctive features depending on the level of the socio-economic development of the countries where they take place, on the degree of maturity of the subjective factor, and depending on what stage of the modern epoch they begin at. The Comintern Programme adopted by its Sixth Congress in 1928 distinguished three types of transition to the dictatorship of the proletariat: for countries of advanced capitalism, for countries with medium level of development of capitalism, and for colonial, semi-colonial, and dependent countries.¹

It should also be noted that the era of transition from capitalism to socialism involves numerous anti-imperialist,

1. See Programme and Rules of the Communist International.
Partizdat, Moscow, 1936, pp. 106-110 (in Russian).

democratic, anti-fascist, and national liberation revolutions.

It is very important to elucidate the specifics of this or that revolution. For instance, national liberation revolutions differing in form and content took and take place in former colonies and semi-colonies. Some of them, being essentially bourgeois-democratic, at the same time represent definite links of the world revolutionary process and, in this connection, assume new features and peculiarities, new developmental prospects. They no longer fully match the old boundaries of bourgeois revolutions.

A historical method is needed in approaching a social revolution. As a mode of achieving a transition from one socio-economic formation to another, the revolution, from epoch to epoch, assumes new features to become more complicated. In this case, the role therein of popular masses grows. Whereas in revolutions of the epoch of transition from slave-ownership to feudalism, the fruits of mass actions by slaves were virtually fully usurped by an insignificant majority of exploiters, the situation in bourgeois and particularly in bourgeois-democratic revolution is essentially different. To some extent, the masses of peasants obtain social advantages from these revolutions, and in some cases leave an imprint of their influence on their course. In the early stages of class society, social revolution involved separate uncoordinated movements and uprisings. Later revolutions increasingly assume the features of an integral process, whose elements become ever more closely interrelated.

With the transition to higher stages of social development, the objective tasks of social revolutions become more complex. From the chiefly spontaneous and regional action, which it was in the early stages of human society, in the modern era the revolution turns into a world revolutionary process, in which conscious political activity by the foremost class becomes a prerequisite for its development and victory. The social revolution finds its full expression in a socialist revolution, which frees society of all forms of exploitation and oppression to lay down the beginnings of the communist socio-economic formation, in

which, according to Marx, social evolutions will cease to be political revolutions. Such is the origin of social revolution.

2. Objective Conditions and the Subjective Factor of Social Revolution

In its development, any revolution passes a number of stages, each of which prepares conditions for the following one. In a very general form, one can distinguish five basic stages in the development of a social revolution: (1) the period of maturation of objective socio-economic prerequisites; (2) the period of a national crisis and struggle for political power; (3) the period of a revolutionary situation and mass political unrest; (4) political upheaval and establishment of the authority of a new, more progressive class; (5) the period of consolidating the results of the revolution. Naturally, a specific revolution may involve various kinds of deviations from this periodisation whereby the said periods would be increasingly subdivided, and characterised by blurred and incomplete transitions.

The classes and social strata, which with regard to their objective status within the system of production relations are interested in the overthrow of the existing system and are able to take part in the struggle for the victory of a more progressive system, come out as the motive forces of social revolution. For instance, the motive forces of a bourgeois revolution in the current epoch are the working class, the peasantry, and various petty-bourgeois elements in town and country. The motive forces of a socialist revolution are the working class, the poor peasantry, and various other oppressed strata.

A social revolution occurs only as a result of profound social changes that put the masses into motion. As Lenin noted, "the only effective force that compels change is popular revolutionary energy."¹

1. V.I. Lenin, Collected Works, Vol. 23, p. 215.

Revolutionary periods in history are distinguished by very quick and very deep social changes precisely because they are implemented by the popular masses. Their actions provide for the most radical socio-economic and political changes. For example, the English bourgeois revolution of the 18th century is usually associated with the name of Oliver Cromwell. However, it is well known that the protector of England adhered to conservative views and had time and again tried to end the revolution by a compromise with the king, and that only powerful pressure from below interfered with these plans.

The history of revolutions proves that only the people are capable of breaking the resistance of the ruling class, to paralyse the repressive bodies of the state machine, and to suppress and destroy the old superstructure. Hence, the maturity of objective socio-economic conditions for a revolution should transform into the political movement of the masses, find their reflection in a rapid growth of revolutionary sentiments among the oppressed classes, and in their political activity. In other words, this requires a revolutionary situation, or a political situation characterised by mass revolutionary excitement. A revolutionary situation testifies to the fact that revolution has ripened, and that the question of winning power by the foremost class is now on the agenda. The following basic features distinguish a revolutionary situation.

First, "the crisis of the upper strata", i.e. the impossibility for the upper classes to retain their dominance in the same form. A crisis in the policy of the ruling class creates the fissure in which the discontent and indignation of the oppressed classes breaks through. Lenin noted that for a revolution to occur it is usually insufficient for the "lower strata" to be unwilling to live in the old way, it is also required that the "upper strata" were unable to do so.

Second, an acute aggravation of social antagonisms between the ruling class and the oppressed classes. This aggravation may be connected with economic disasters for the broad strata of the population. It may be engendered

by lack of social rights, deprivations of the masses, and other factors that stem from the contradictions of the given system and in one way or another induce the suppressed classes to protest.

Third, considerably increased political activity and organisation of the masses. In such periods, the revolutionary classes become free of passivity and inertia inherent in times of relatively "quiet" development. Militant sentiments rapidly grow, and passions seethe to splash outside. The masses literally strain towards politics, and revolutionary organisations come into being or consolidate.

The time when a revolutionary situation arises and its form and development rate depend on the whole system of socio-political relations: on the condition of the state machinery, the strength of the positions of the ruling class, the strength of the revolutionary class and its relations with other sections of the population and accumulation of that class of political experience.

The revolutionary situation is characterised by mounting dynamism. In its development, it passes through several stages, beginning from scarcely noticeable signs of mass unrest and ending with a national crisis which develops into a revolution. The higher the stage of the revolutionary situation, the greater is the role assumed in its further development by the ability and readiness of revolutionary classes to carry out urgent reforms. In a period of a national crisis, this factor becomes decisive. Not every revolutionary situation attains the highest stage and turns into a revolution. If progressive classes are for some reason unprepared for active and organised actions, the revolutionary situation starts to abate, mass revolutionary excitement declines, and the revolutionary fuse disappears; the ruling class then seeks the means to retain power in its hands.

The concept of revolutionary situation is extremely important for the strategy and tactics of the revolutionary working-class movement. History shows that attempts by revolutionaries to overthrow the power of the ruling classes in the absence of a revolutionary situation end in failure.

The theorists of petty-bourgeois revolutionism claim that everything depends on the will of revolutionaries, whose possibilities are bounded by nothing except their own desire to stage a revolution. They say that if there is no revolutionary situation, it supposedly can and must be created by the efforts of the conscious minority, by organising a revolutionary "hotbed", or a kind of "detonator" designed to awake the masses and bring them into motion. In the view of voluntarist theorists, a revolutionary "hotbed" represents a likeness of a "little motor", whose work would actuate the "motor" of mass movement, and they do not take into account that fuel and oxygen, i.e. the sympathy of and support by the masses, is needed for the "little motor" to function uninterruptedly. If these are absent, the "little motor" quickly stalls without imparting its impulse to the "big motor". Such is the immutable conclusion of theory repeatedly confirmed by practice.

In condemning subjectivism and voluntarism, Marxism-Leninism at the same time also rejects a passive-onlooker attitude towards revolution as a fatal process. No revolution, even with maximally ripe objective conditions, can take place outside active revolutionary activity of the foremost classes. Lenin wrote: "It would be a mistake to think that the revolutionary classes are invariably strong enough to effect a revolution whenever such a revolution has fully matured by virtue of the conditions of social and economic development. No, human society is not constituted so rationally or so conveniently for progressive elements. A revolution may be ripe, and yet the forces of its creators may prove insufficient to carry it out, in which case society decays, and this process of decay sometimes drags on for very many years."¹

Apart from ripe objective conditions, a revolution is in need of a subjective factor, the ability of revolutionary classes for actions that would suffice to resolve pressing revolutionary tasks. The subjective factor is also historical,

1. V.I. Lenin, Collected Works, Vol. 9, p. 368.

and the demands towards it grow from epoch to epoch. The subjective factor in contemporary revolutions of necessity involves: (1) revolutionary awareness of the masses, and their readiness and resolve to fight till victory; (2) organisation of the masses and their vanguard, and unity and solidarity in the struggle; (3) guidance of the masses by a party that is sufficiently experienced, armed with a scientific ideology, and capable of working out a correct strategy and tactics to consistently implement them. In the early stages of class society, actions by the oppressed peoples in a social revolution were chiefly of a spontaneous nature. A socialist revolution requires conscious activity by the working class guided by a Marxist-Leninist party.

The presence of both objective prerequisites and the subjective factor is needed for a social revolution to triumph. Such is the basic law of all great revolutions.

How to Defend a Revolution

The objective requirements of social progress ultimately predetermine the victory of a revolution.

However, at every concrete stage, its outcome is not the same and depends on the existing alignment of class forces, on maturity of the subjective factor, and on the extent of readiness of revolutionary classes and political parties to solve the tasks that face them. Lenin stressed that "revolutionary periods are mainly such periods in history when the clash of contending social forces, in a comparatively short space of time, decides the question of the country's choice of a direct or a zigzag path of development for a comparatively very long time."¹

The founders of Marxism-Leninism resolutely came up against doctrinaire notions, according to which a social revolution is the automatic result of growing productive forces and is carried out only when objective development itself guarantees complete success without stubborn struggle, with-

1. V.I. Lenin, Collected Works, Vol. 13, p. 22.

out losses, without the risk of temporary defeats. Engels wrote: "...In revolution, as in war, it is of the highest necessity to stake everything on the decisive movement, whatever the odds may be ... It is a matter of course that, in every struggle, he who takes up the gauntlet risks being beaten, and submit to the yoke without drawing the sword?"¹ Selfless activity by the mass forces of a revolution is the decisive factor for its successful development and victory.

So far as revolution is an open struggle between antagonistic classes, it always entails violence. Marx believed, violence to be the midwife of the old society when it is pregnant with the new. The extent and forms of violence depend on the concrete historical conditions in which a revolution develops. They vary from armed suppression to political coercion by peaceful means. Yet, violence itself is but a means, and the objective is to remake the existing socio-economic structure by very diverse means, and to build a new society.

Revolution is always resisted by counter-revolution, which represents a reaction against revolution. In its objective essence, counter-revolution is always regressive, and is directed at preserving or restoring the obsolete social system being swept away by revolution.

Antagonism between the forces of revolution and counter-revolution is an objective law of class struggle in the transition from one socio-economic formation to another. This is due to the fact that the ruling classes never surrender power voluntarily, and put up stubborn resistance against the new system.

In some cases, revolution sweeps away reactionary forces to end in complete victory. This refers to the Great October Socialist Revolution in Russia, and the victorious socialist revolutions in a number of European and Asian countries, and in Cuba. In other cases, counter-revolution takes the upper hand to defeat revolution like, say, the Paris Commune of 1871, the German revolution of 1918, the democratic revoluti-

1. K. Marx, F. Engels, Collected Works, Vol. 11, p. 68.

on of the 1930s in Spain, and the national-democratic revolution in Chile. Occasionally the victory of a revolution is followed by temporary restoration of the old order of things (the Stuart Restoration in England in the 17th century and the Thermidorean reaction of 1794, which was followed by restoration of the Bourbons in France); nevertheless, this can no longer eliminate the deep reforms carried out by the revolution.

Counter-revolutionaries resort to various forms of struggle and subversive activities, including armed actions, civil wars, revolts, conspiracies, sabotage and diversion, intervention by foreign troops, blockade, etc. A decisive victory of the new system deprives counter-revolutionaries of strength to put up open resistance, which takes on more concealed forms.

The danger of counter-revolutionary activity grows at the moment of relative equilibrium of class forces, when the revolutionary classes cannot yet take all power into their hands and achieve a final victory, while the dominant classes can no longer retain control over the course of events, and begin to lose ground. At such moments the struggle becomes increasingly acute. Counter-revolutionaries become more active, they use the levers of authority they still have, their positions, influence and the mass media to bring the revolutionary process to a standstill and turn it backwards. If counter-revolutionaries meet no strong rebuff, they become more aggressive and seek to take advantage of the unstable political situation. A vivid example of this was the situation in Chile following the advent to power of the government of popular unity. Only by constantly keeping the initiative in the hands of revolutionary forces, only their unity and activity make it possible to stop counter-revolution and make it fight on such bridgeheads and in such ways that would meet the interests of the further development of revolution and doom reaction to defeat.

Socially, counter-revolution is based primarily on exploiters classes, which as a result of revolution lose their power, incomes, and privileges. They come out as inspirers and organisers of counter-revolution. Numerically,

these classes constitute an insignificant minority in society. Hence, to oppose revolution they need in a more or less broad mass base. To that end, counter-revolution seeks to split the ranks of the oppressed classes by all means, including fraud, promises, blackmail, slander, and demagogery, to win over politically backward, philistine-minded and wavering sections of the population. Certain strata of the petty bourgeoisie, which, as Lenin stressed, in periods of increasingly acute class struggle "vacillates between revolution and counter-revolution",¹ may become a social basis for counter-revolutionary sentiments. This basis, for one thing, gives rise to Bonapartism, a specific form of counter-revolutionary personal dictatorship that balances on contradictions of class interests.

Among the sources of the strength of counter-revolution or, as Lenin put it, "reserves of combustibles"² are petty-bourgeois vacillation, sluggishness, force of habit, international ties of reaction, still retained valuables and riches, and connections with the most skilled personnel in the economy, administration, information media, and military affairs. Counter-revolution takes advantage of the mistakes of revolutionary classes, and also of extremist actions by leftist groups so as to scare away different sections of the public. Ultra-leftist adventurers, by juggling with revolutionary phraseology, in reality objectively play the role of accomplices of counter-revolution.

The success of the struggle against counter-revolution depends on how timely and quickly it can be deprived of its sources of strength and isolated from mass social forces and organisations. This requires daring actions directed at immediately eliminating the hotbeds of counter-revolution, at resolutely suppressing leftist escapades and, above all, at deepening and culminating the revolution.

1. V.I. Lenin, Collected Works, Vol. 10, p. 265.

2. *Ibid.*, Vol. 9, p. 463.

The Struggle Against Counter-Revolution

In world historical perspective, counter-revolution is doomed. However,

it can delay social progress and cause zigzags and retreats in development. As a rule, counter-revolution is accompanied by cruel terror. This was vividly testified to by the bloody orgies of the men from Versailles after the downfall of the Paris Commune in 1871, by the mass shootings of workers after the defeat of the Russian bourgeois-democratic revolution of 1905-1907, by the white terror that followed after the Hungarian Soviet Republic was crushed in 1919, by the tragedy of Chile in 1973, and by other instances of counter-revolutionary violence.

The need to suppress all activity by counter-revolutionary forces is responsible for a major law of social revolution, a law clearly formulated by Lenin: "No revolution is worth anything unless it can defend itself..."¹

Western sociologists claim that there is a certain fatal "Law of Thermidore", according to which any revolution culminates in Thermidorean reaction. These claims are based on distortion and absolutisation of certain features of bourgeois revolutions. Under the onslaught of the popular masses, these revolutions often went much further than their bourgeois leaders wanted them to go. This "running ahead" was followed by a "rolling back" revolutionary wave. The bourgeoisie, not infrequently in alliance with the overthrown feudal elements, made efforts to stop the revolution, to turn it back, and to limit it within the framework of their own class interests. These understandable tendencies invariably met counter-action from "below". However, taking advantage of the masses' inexperience, the bourgeoisie made an abrupt turn to establish a reactionary dictatorial regime and thus take away from the people the gains that threatened the foundations of the bourgeois system.

The development of a socialist revolution may involve

1. V.I. Lenin, Collected Works, Vol. 28, p. 124.

dangers and "recoils" under the onslaught of petty-bourgeois elements. Lenin said: If we do not beat these elements, "we shall slide down as the French Revolution did".¹ However, these tendencies are overcome by consolidating the political authority of the working class, and by carrying out measures that expand the social base of the revolution and make the non-proletarian strata of the working people rally round the working class in building socialism.

To overcome backward trends in the development of a social revolution and to bring that revolution to fruition, the period of consolidating its results has paramount significance. The objective tasks of that period are to stabilise the political authority of the foremost class, to implement the economic and social programmes of the revolution, and to take measures to defend its gains from internal and external counter-revolution.

3. Socialist Revolution

Higher Type of Social Revolutions

A socialist, or proletarian revolution represents a higher type of social

revolutions. It involves a complex of destructive and creative tasks, namely for the working class, to gain power; to break down the old state machinery; to establish public ownership of the means of production; to create a system of planned management of economic and social processes; to eliminate class and national antagonisms and exploitation of man by man; to develop socialist democracy; and to carry out a cultural revolution. A socialist revolution makes a radical turn in development of society, and signifies a transition from mankind's pre-history to its real history.

The principal task of a socialist revolution is "the positive or constructive work of setting up an extremely intricate and delicate system of new organisational relationships extending to the planned production and distribution of the goods required for the existence of tens of millions

1. V.I. Lenin, Collected Works, Vol. 32, p. 282.

of people. Such a revolution can be successfully carried out only if the majority of the population, and primarily the majority of the working people, engage in independent creative work as makers of history."¹

The deep-rooted economic foundation of socialist revolution is the conflict between the social character of production and the capitalist form of appropriation. By attaining gigantic dimensions and high degree of socialisation under capitalism, the productive forces enter into contradiction with the existing capitalist relations of production. This in itself, however, does not cause "stagnation" and "automatic collapse of capitalism". Capitalist production relations possess certain flexibility, and can react to the objective requirements of the productive forces. The result is an evolution of capitalist forms of ownership from private individual ownership to private collective ownership, and then to the even more depersonalised form of state-monopoly ownership, which creates certain possibilities for the further growth of the productive forces within the framework of capitalist mode of production.

The main contradiction of capitalism manifests itself in the sphere of class relations in the form of antagonism between labour and capital, between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie. A socialist revolution develops from the class struggle of the working class whose very position in the system of capitalist production relations advances it to the role of the principal motive force and the leader of socialist revolution.

The working class is not alone in the struggle for socialism. The social composition of capitalist society is heterogeneous. Besides classes and social groups that have remained from previous socio-economic formations (peasants, artisans and handicraftsmen, other social strata), office and professional workers, engineers, technicians and researchers, and also small entrepreneurs grow in number under

1. V.I. Lenin, Collected Works, Vol. 27, p. 241.

capitalism. All these social groups experience mounting oppression from monopoly capital. With regard to status, they draw closer to the working class and can side with it in the struggle for a socialist remaking of society. The alliance of the working class with the non-proletarian strata of the working people is an essential prerequisite for the victory of a socialist revolution.

In all so far victorious socialist revolutions, the poor peasantry was the chief ally of the working class. This is explained by the fact that the victory of socialism meets the fundamental interests of the working peasantry. It is readily foreseeable that in Latin American countries, where the peasantry constitutes a large part of the population, the victory of the working class in the struggle for socialism is unthinkable without an alliance with the former. In developed capitalist countries, the peasantry is decreasing in number. Nevertheless, the paramount task in the struggle for democracy and socialism in that part of the world is to win over the working peasantry to the side of the working class. At the same time, the number and influence of the scientific and technical intelligentsia and other categories of people occupied in brain work are steadily growing in developed capitalist countries, this being due to the scientific and technological revolution. The fundamental economic and political interests of most intellectuals are closely intertwined with those of the working class. In these conditions, the alliance of workers with intellectuals becomes a significant force in the anti-monopoly struggle. The task of winning over the urban middle strata to the side of the working class is also of tremendous importance. Experience shows that their stands may have decisive influence on the outcome of a revolution. The working class, the working peasantry, the intelligentsia and other social strata objectively interested in crushing the power of capital and in establishing socialism constitute the social base, upon which the mass political forces of a socialist revolution form.

A major act of a socialist revolution is the winning

of political power by the working class. To solve this task, the working class must enjoy the sympathy and support of the majority of working people so that the actions of the revolutionary vanguard would rely on a movement involving the broad masses.

Alignment of World Forces and the Revolutionary Process

The socialist revolution of today is international in character. It stems from the contradictions

of imperialism as a world system. However, these contradictions grow unevenly in various countries. As a result of the uneven economic and political development of capitalism, some countries become the focuses of the most acute contradictions. In the presence of mature socio-political revolutionary forces, these countries turn into the weakest links within the capitalist system. That is why socialist revolutions in various countries triumph at different times. Lenin wrote: "Uneven economic and political development is an absolute law of capitalism. Hence, the victory of socialism is possible first in several or even in one capitalist country alone."¹ The revolution initially triumphed in Russia, where in the early 20th century conditions were most favourable for a breakthrough in the imperialist chain.

The socialist revolution is unity in multiformity. Historically, the initial form of transition from capitalism to socialism was the Great October Socialist Revolution. In addition to the general laws inherent in it, the Great October Socialist Revolution also bears the imprint of Russia's historical peculiarities and the characteristics of its time. The people's democratic revolutions in a number of European countries also had their distinctive features, such as multi-stage development, relatively long period of establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat, and intertwining of socialist tasks with the tasks of the general democratic anti-fascist struggle. The socialist revolutions in Korea,

1. V.I. Lenin, Collected Works, Vol. 21, p. 342.

Vietnam and Cuba also developed in their own peculiar way.

Lenin developed a new approach to the analysis of premises essential for the socialist revolution. Previously, in examining this question, Marxists paid attention chiefly to internal conditions in a given country. Lenin proved that this approach was already insufficient and showed that it was henceforth necessary to proceed from the state of the entire world capitalist system. Revolution in a given country is essentially a breakthrough in a weak link in the common chain of imperialism. The Leninist approach to the analysis of the premises of the revolution has acquired a particularly large significance in connection with the shifts that have taken on the world scene in recent decades. Besides, one should bear in mind that the numerous factors that started to show at the beginning of the century have now fully developed; simultaneously, new heretofore non-existent factors have appeared.

When Lenin was writing Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism and his other works, in which he advanced the basic tenets of his new theory of socialist revolution, there was still no country in the world where a socialist revolution had triumphed; even after the October Revolution, the victory of socialism in the USSR could not have been regarded as final. Today, socialism has fully triumphed in the Soviet Union and has embraced a number of states to produce growing influence on international development.

Previously, on the eve of and following the First World War, the national liberation movement was making its first steps: at that time, a small handful of imperialist powers was subjugating the peoples of Asia, Africa, and Latin America. Today, the national liberation movement has reached a gigantic scope: the colonial system of imperialism has collapsed, new politically independent states are appearing, and most of them seek to pursue a policy independent of imperialism.

In the current epoch, the epoch of transition from capitalism to socialism, the approach to an analysis of conditions for maturation of a socialist revolution in a given country, to the course and prospects of that revolu-

tion, is changing. An assessment of the internal stage of the world capitalist system as a whole and in each individual country continues to be a starting point of that approach. However, in modern conditions, one cannot limit it solely to that assessment: one must take into account not only existing tendencies in the development of imperialism, but also the new position capitalism takes up in the world, the alignment of forces between the world systems, the effect of the successes of socialist and communist construction on the world liberation movement, and the role of the peoples' national liberation struggle.

The fact that the alignment of forces on the world scene is steadily changing, this being characterised by increasing weakening of the system of imperialism and the growing might of world socialism, has special significance for the prospects of the revolutionary movement. Lenin said that after 1917 no international development could be understood correctly without taking into consideration the existence of Soviet Russia. The more so, no development can be understood today without taking into account the existence of the socialist community.

In our time, the development of real socialism has great influence on the course of the liberation movement; it aggravates all the contradictions of capitalism to irreversibly pose the question of the very existence of the capitalist system itself.

In no way do the international tasks of socialist states stem from any claims to world supremacy by this or that socialist country. Nor are they connected with attempts to impose the socialist way of life on other peoples. Communists are convinced that ideology cannot be brought to other countries by bayonets. The triumph of socialism in the whole world is a natural and law-governed historical process caused by internal development conditions in capitalist countries, and it does not need to be either "spurred" or "sped up" from outside. At the same time, the struggle for socialism in every country is inseparably connected with the struggle for socialism in the whole world. In effect,

the building of socialism in individual countries simultaneously constitutes a contribution to the creation of a new society on a worldwide scale.

On the other hand, as long as there are capitalist states, there is continued need in joint defence of the gains of socialism from all encroachments. This also explains the international nature of the tasks of every socialist country.

Finally, one cannot ignore the fact that the monopoly bourgeoisie in every capitalist country maintains very extensive international ties and provides mutual support in its struggle against the working class and national liberation movement.

Relying on the strength of world capital, the monopoly bourgeoisie had time and again succeeded in crushing the liberation movement. Today, all working people seek to counter international alliances of the bourgeoisie with unity and solidarity.

This explains the profound international nature of the tasks of each socialist state. All of them bear responsibility for the destiny of socialism within the framework of the whole community of socialist states, and for the destiny of socialism and progress in the whole world.

Fundamental shifts in the alignment of forces on the international scene in favour of socialism have created a historically new situation, which was non-existent in the early decades of the 20th century: today, the socialist states and world progressive movements can provide real aid to countries threatened by the forces of international reaction.

Relying on the economic and political support of the socialist system, any world country, irrespective of its level of development, can start the transition to socialism.

The emergence and development of people's democratic revolutions into socialist revolutions has become possible not only by virtue of specific conditions of internal development in a number of European and Asian countries, and in Cuba, but also in connection with the fundamental shifts occurring on the world scene. The existence of the USSR,

its contribution to the victory over Hitlerite fascism and Japanese militarism, and its active moral and material support helped the peoples of these countries achieve socialist revolutions in the least painful ways.

New, more favourable conditions for transition to socialism open up in connection with the possibility to prevent wars in the modern epoch.

It is natural that Communists, as the spokesmen of the aspirations of the masses, do everything to make this possibility a reality. The development of the most up-to-date weapons of mass destruction, viz. the atomic and hydrogen bombs, and also means for delivering them to any point on the globe, has fundamentally changed the nature of war to make it increasingly destructive. A world war involving the use of thermonuclear weapons would virtually involve no difference between the line of battle and the home front. It would lead to complete destruction of the main centres of civilisation and of entire peoples, and would, in fact, bring innumerable calamities to all mankind. Only maniacs could wish such a catastrophe.

Now, what effect would a world war involving thermonuclear weapons have on socialist revolutions and the struggle of the masses for socialism? Naturally, if imperialist maniacs try to unleash a world war, this would evoke such indignation of the masses that the system of capitalism, which periodically engenders wars, would inevitably perish. However, the working class does not think of creating a communist civilisation on the ruins of world centres of culture, on an earth devastated by and contaminated with thermonuclear fallouts, an inevitable consequence of such a war. For some peoples, the question of socialism would fall away altogether, since they would physically disappear from the face of the globe.

It is therefore obvious that a modern nuclear war in itself could in no way be a factor that would accelerate revolution and hasten the victory of socialism. On the contrary, it would throw back mankind, the world revolutionary movement, the building of socialism and communism by many decades.

At the same time, it is clear that, under the new alignment of forces, the struggle against militarism is a major prerequisite to developing the liberation movement. This is first of all due to the fact that imperialism has presently tied itself and its economics, politics, and ideology with preparations for war to an unprecedented extent. Militarisation of the economy and the arms race in imperialist countries have reached a tremendous scope, and this has led to deformed changes in the whole structure of the capitalist economy. The foreign policy of US imperialism is based on balancing on the brink of war and on blowing up the myth about communism's "aggressiveness". Hence, it is clear that strengthening of peace on earth deals a blow to imperialism in its most sensitive place - militarism.

Democratic and Socialist Tasks

In our time, Lenin's theory on the development of a democratic revolution into a socialist revolution has also acquired new features. It permits to determine correctly the place and prospects of all democratic movements of today. The present epoch is characterised by tremendously increased significance of democratic tasks, by broad development of democratic movements. This is first of all connected with the further growth of the reactionary and aggressive character of imperialism. A special role in this respect was played by the fact that monopoly capitalism had transformed into state-monopoly capitalism. At present, this process, indicated already by Lenin, has in the main taken place in all developed capitalist countries. Contrary to the hopes of the bourgeoisie, state-monopoly capitalism has not only deepened the traditional contradictions of capitalist society, but also engendered new antagonisms.

The contradiction between labour and capital, between a handful of monopolists who had concentrated the enormous wealth in their hands, and the working class has become even more acute.

Capitalism cannot fully eliminate unemployment and ensure all working people good living conditions. State-monopoly capitalism constantly threatens the socio-economic

gains of the working class. Government control over the economic struggle of the proletariat is becoming increasingly strong, and interference of the bourgeois state in labour-capital relations is assuming ever more diverse forms. However, the ruling circles of imperialist countries find it increasingly difficult to pursue their anti-labour policies, which encounters organised resistance from the working masses which come out for preservation of their social rights.

Along with the principal class contradiction of bourgeois society -- between the bourgeoisie and the working class -- the contradiction between monopolies and all the other social strata is becoming increasingly acute. Relying on the state, monopolies have seized all the basic economic and political levers to exploit not only the working class, but also the peasantry, the urban petty bourgeoisie, the intelligentsia, and office employees. The interests and policy of a small group of monopolies come into contradiction on a number of important social problems even with the interests of the non-monopoly bourgeoisie.

The development of state-monopoly capitalism naturally results in a greater aspiration of the most powerful imperialist states to world supremacy. The imperialist claims of such powers spread not only to economically underdeveloped areas of the globe -- these age-old objects of colonisation, but also to industrially developed capitalist states.

All these new phenomena in the development of capitalism have aggravated the issues involved in the present-day struggle for democracy.

Concentration of wealth, strength, power and privileges on one end, in the hands of a small group of monopolies which inspire an sprawling arms race, inevitably causes a counter tendency on the other end -- to activate the struggle of the broadest sections of the population for their rights, for restoration of trampled democracy, against militarists, and against the power of monopolies.

In bourgeois society, the class struggle therefore develops wide and deep to promote broad democratic movements combining various classes and social strata, for instance the movement of peoples for universal peace and against the

danger of a nuclear war; and the struggle in the defence of democratic freedoms and institutions, and against the advance of fascism and reaction. These movements also involve actions for nationalisation of capitalist monopoly property, demands for agrarian reforms, and for greater rights to women and young people, the humanistic movement in the defence of culture, and many other mass movements.

Democratic and socialist tasks in developed capitalist countries are so intertwined that one can hardly demarcate them. Presumably, the revolutionary process will start with resolving general democratic tasks to develop continuously.

In this case, the main forces of reaction, namely the monopoly bourgeois groups and their direct proxies in governments, would be smashed already at the initial stage. This would open the road for a quick revolution towards a socialist upheaval.

Understandably, the principal requirement for such a development — the guiding role of the working class — retains its force. The fact that this is not speculative reasoning is best proven by the experience of people's democratic revolutions in the countries of Central and Southeast Europe, revolutions which had developed on the basis of general democratic anti-fascist movements.

Forms of Transition to Socialism

The current epoch has also introduced quite many new factors into the issue on specific forms

of transition of power into the hands of the working class, an important component question in Lenin's theory of socialist revolution.

Lenin constantly emphasised that the proletariat must master all the forms of struggle, both non-peaceful and peaceful. He wrote that "in order to accomplish its task the revolutionary class must be able to master all forms or aspects of social activity without exception, ... must be prepared for the most rapid and brusque replacement of one form by another."¹ Like before, today this tenet underlies

¹ V.I. Lenin, Collected Works, Vol. 31, p. 96.

the approach of Marxist-Leninist parties to the ways of winning power by the working class. Any attempt to ignore the diversity of methods for taking power by the working class and to identify revolution under all conditions with armed uprising and civil war would throw the working class movement back to blanquism.

In the wake of Marx, Lenin in principle assumed the possibility of a peaceful revolution. Moreover, when in the course of the Russian revolution in April-June 1917 prospects appeared for taking power by peaceful means, Lenin suggested to take immediate advantage of this opportunity, notwithstanding even the fact that the Communists still had no majority in the Soviets. He wrote that "at that exceptional moment in history, a peaceful development of the revolution is possible and probable if all power is transferred to the Soviets."¹ And only in response to violence by the bourgeoisie (shooting of a peaceful demonstration in July 1917) the slogan of an armed uprising was put forward.

Lenin predicted that different nations would come to socialism not in quite the same way as regards methods for achieving revolution. He underlined the universality of the type of socialist revolution, the principle of the dictatorship of the proletariat and of the new, Soviet democracy, and not their forms. For example, in elucidating the prospects of the liberation movement in colonial and dependent countries, Lenin wrote that "the subsequent revolutions in Oriental countries, which possess much vaster populations and a much vaster diversity of social conditions, will undoubtedly display even greater distinctions than the Russian revolution".²

Historical experience has fully corroborated Lenin's prevision on a large variety of forms in transition to socialism. And one could hardly doubt that in the future the forms of transition to socialism would become even more diverse, since the concrete conditions in each non-socialist

1. V.I. Lenin, Collected Works, Vol. 26, p. 37.

2. Ibid., Vol. 33, p. 480.

country are extremely different.

It fell to the lot of Russia's working class, which achieved the world's first socialist revolution, to overcome the particularly fierce resistance of internal counter-revolution and international reaction. For a long time, the Soviet Republic remained alone face to face with a hostile capitalist world. This explains the fact that the revolution in Russia involved a most sanguinary civil war imposed by internal and external reaction. The task of subsequent revolutions is incomparably easier primarily because they rely on the powerful support of the USSR and the whole socialist system. In none of the now existing socialist countries have the forms, methods, and ways of the socialist revolution been a mechanical repetition of outside experience. Take the GDR or Poland, Hungary or Cuba, Mongolia or Yugoslavia -- all the socialist countries, in fact, carried out the revolution in their own way, using forms that were dictated by the correlation of class forces in each of these countries, by the national distinctions and the external situation.

There had been armed struggle and peaceful forms of passage to the new social system; there had been rapid coming to power of the labouring classes and processes that had dragged out in time. In some countries the revolution had to defend itself against foreign intervention, others had been spared any outside invasions.

A major factor predetermining the greater variety of forms in transition to socialism today is the tremendously increasing significance of general democratic tasks and the wide scope of general democratic movements. The working-class revolution, which is based on broader socio-political alliances than before, will ensure an overwhelming preponderance of progressive forces over the reactionary bourgeoisie inside the country. This, in turn, will lead to the creation of a broad democratic unity of forces around the proletarian revolution and the new government, and will permit, among other things, to use parliamentary forms for transition to socialism.

philosophy, man creates for himself a strong foundation for the individual's constructive and productive social activity. Lenin wrote: "... A socialist requires a well-thought-out and consistent world outlook, so that he may control the events and not the events him."¹ The Marxist-Leninist world outlook teaches every man not only to think but act correctly.

Being the science on the more general laws of world development, Marxist-Leninist philosophy is at the same time the theoretical foundation of the ideology and policy of the working class and its parties. Marx wrote: "As philosophy finds its material weapons in the proletariat, so the proletariat finds its spiritual weapons in philosophy."² The class interests of the proletariat coincide with the objective laws of historical development. That is why the proletariat is profoundly interested in the objective reflection of reality which scientific philosophy provides. That is why creative study of Marxism-Leninism is an important task of all forces struggling for socialism. Engels indicated that "socialism, since it has become a science, demands that it be pursued as a science, that is, that it be studied."³

The great materialists Marx, Engels and Lenin called themselves Communists, and they called Communists practical materialists, seeing in this a profound theoretical and political meaning, since "the political line of Marxism is inseparably bound up with its philosophical principles."⁴ That is why the defence of the philosophical foundations of Marxism-Leninism is a major task of communist and workers' parties. Historical experience shows that the correctness of the party's political line largely depends on a scientifically-grounded philosophical stand. Where the party's activity stems from a "parody on Marxism" (Lenin), not from materialist dialectics, there are right and 'left' opportunist-

1. V.I. Lenin, Collected Works, Vol. 8, p. 316.

2. K. Marx, F. Engels, Collected Works, Vol. 3, p. 187.

3. K. Marx and F. Engels, Selected Works in three volumes, Vol. 2, Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1976, p. 170.

4. V.I. Lenin, Collected Works, Vol. 15, p. 405.

CONCLUSION

Marxist-Leninist philosophy is a scientific, creatively developing teaching about the more general laws of development of nature, society and thought. It emerged as a theoretical answer to the practical problems, whose solution constitutes the historic mission of the proletariat, called upon to put an end to the system of capitalist relations and build a classless, communist society.

Having critically imbibed and creatively assimilated all the achievements of world philosophical culture, Marxism at the same time became a qualitatively new stage in its development. For the first time in the history of philosophy, the materialist teaching on matter and its cognition was organically connected with a dialectical view on the world and was laid down as a foundation for understanding social phenomena. Materialist dialectics, according to Lenin's apt remark, is the life-giving basis, "soul" of Marxism, and a scientific method for cognising and revolutionary remaking the world. Unlike all the other philosophical systems which restricted themselves to theoretically interpreting the Universe, Marxist philosophy perceives its task in helping to practically transform the world on the basis of humanist principles. The creation of dialectical and historical materialism was a great intellectual feat of Marx, Engels and Lenin, for it permitted mankind to find theoretically-and historically-grounded ways to freedom and progress.

Now, what does the study of Marxist-Leninist philosophy give to man? By arming him with a knowledge of the more general laws of development of nature, society and thought, it brings within his reach the achievements of world culture, teaches him the art of cognising a contradictory world, and shapes his intellect.

Marxist-Leninist philosophy provides man with a harmonious and scientifically-grounded world outlook as an organic system of views on the world surrounding him and on his place in this world. By profoundly mastering Marxist-Leninist

philosophical culture, and scientific thought. In these conditions, the significance of Marxist-Leninist philosophy vastly grows.

Dialectics teaches that successes in the struggle of the new against the old do not come about by themselves. Social progress is, in fact, the product of historical creation, the result of conscious and purposefully directed activity of the popular masses, who transform the objective possibility of forward development into historical activity. This is an expression of the growing role of the subjective factor in the current epoch, the epoch of revolutionary transition from capitalism to socialism and communism. Increasingly new social forces with different political orientations are becoming involved in the process of revolutionary transformations on the globe. In such conditions, the task to creatively master and develop the Marxist-Leninist teaching and to adequately incarnate it in the revolutionary consciousness and behaviour of the masses assumes special significance. Lenin wrote in this connection: "When the masses are digesting a new and exceptionally rich experience of direct revolutionary struggle, the theoretical struggle for a revolutionary outlook, i.e., for revolutionary Marxism, becomes the watchword of the day."¹

Marxist-Leninist philosophy always developed in principled struggle against bourgeois ideology and philosophical revisionism. The current epoch is no exception, and is moreover characterised by sharply intensified ideological struggle. The substance of its present stage lies in that the accomplices of imperialism are ever more openly directing it into the channel of criticism of real socialism. "For them the main thing is to turn people against socialism;² to discredit the socialist ideal by replacing it with the idols of the socio-political realities of bourgeois society. To them, the ideological struggle is assuming a specific

1. V.I. Lenin, Collected Works, Vol. 15, p. 290.

2. Documents and Resolutions. The 26th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, p. 13.

ist deviations and twists in politics.

Where lies the source of strength and viability of the Marxist-Leninist teaching? First of all in that it is a materialist teaching relying on a solid foundation of scientific knowledge verified by historical practice. Second, in that it is a dialectical teaching, which reflects in its principles, laws and categories the objective dialectics of the world's development. Third, in that it is a humane teaching, which regards a concrete human being as the highest and everlasting social value. Fourth, in that it is a creative teaching, which "does not provide ready-made dogmas, but criteria for further research and the method for this research."¹ Fifth, in that it is a proletarian teaching, which is an ideological expression of the political interests of the working class, the most progressive and influential social force of today. Sixth, in that it is a revolutionary teaching, which regards social revolution as the only possible form of transition to a new society. Seventh, in that it is a communist teaching, which orients mankind to communist development, and is the philosophy of historical optimism. Eighth, in that it is an international teaching, which unites all the progressive forces of our time for a struggle against the forces of imperialism and reaction, for peace, democracy and social progress.

The present-day stage of mankind's development is characterised by extraordinary dynamic power and multiform social change of truly world historical significance. The steadfast growth of the forces and influence of real socialism, the resuscitation to a new life of countries that have liberated themselves from colonial dependence, the crisis phenomena in the economy and politics of capitalist countries, the struggle of peoples for peace, against the arms race, the strengthening of the ideological struggle, and the scientific and technological revolution - all these prompt mankind to seek new vital reference-points and present new demands to people's ideological convictions,

1. Marx, Engels, Selected Correspondence, Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1975, p. 455.

kind of world-view nihilism is closely connected with preaching pluralism in philosophy and politics, i.e. with preaching multiplicity of "truths" and equipotence of ideological and political trends.

The objective logic of scientific and social development disproves these views. Truth, unlike delusion, always exists in singular form; the multiformity of ways to attain objective truth does not signify multiplicity of truths in one and the same question. The principle of dialectico-materialist monism underlying the Marxist outlook reliably guarantees the quest of truth from voluntaristic distortions and pluralistic vagaries. The progressing awareness of the need to follow this principle in science, philosophy and politics shows in the growing authority of the Marxist-Leninist teaching in the modern world, in conscious inclination towards Marxism on the part of scientists and public figures, a tendency that has come to be a characteristic sign of our time.

The increasing role of science in the life of present-day society shows an organic fusion of the scientific and technological revolution with the social conditions under which it takes place, an organic unity of the "technological" and "anthropological" aspects of social progress. The answer to the question in what direction would human development take, and whether this would be a way of progress and prosperity or a way that would bring mankind to catastrophe would depend on the qualities of the social conditions in which the scientific and technological revolution will develop. Marxism-Leninism proceeds from the fact that only socialism can provide humanistic forms to scientific and technological progress. A major social purpose of Marxist philosophy is to help mankind create and become aware of new value reference-points that would exclude any possibility of utilising the achievements of science to the detriment of man.

In this respect, the problem of how to preserve the peace and prevent a world thermonuclear war assumes paramount significance. It is so acute today because for the first time in history the means of waging war have by far exceeded its objectives: according to UN assessments, today nuclear weapons can destroy fifteen times all living creatures on earth.

form designed to deidealise the socialist system and belittle the socialist gains. Resultant polemics of Communists with their class opponents is possible only if the former creatively master the Marxist-Leninist world outlook, the theoretical expression of the socialist ideal. As evidenced by historical practice, which never belies reality, the building of socialism and communism is the irreversible process of progressive transformations on our planet, a process that acquires more and more new supporters. The movement towards socialism is irrevocable, as Marxism-Leninism teaches us, and this instils the feeling of historical optimism in all people of good will.

The 20th century is significant not only by increasingly rapid and large-scale progressive social transformations, but also by exceptionally dynamic development of all forms of intellectual culture. In this case, the vanguard role rightfully belongs to science, which is increasingly becoming a direct productive force of social development. Mankind has entered the epoch of "information explosion", an era involving the appearance of increasingly new branches of knowledge and more intensive integrational processes in science and culture. Creative comprehension and use of these phenomena would be impossible without synthetic philosophical generalisation, without a scientifically-grounded ideological foundation. The well-known theoretical physicist Max Planck said: "The researcher's outlook will always determine the direction of his work". The great scientific discoveries of our century corroborate these words.

Present-day bourgeois culture is characterised by opposition of science to world outlook. Some trends in bourgeois philosophy deny altogether the presence in science of world-view problems. In proclaiming special scientific knowledge the highest social value, they think that this knowledge is in itself capable of providing man with orientation in the world. Other philosophical trends, in recognising the specifics and necessity of world-view problems, see a major means for forming a life outlook not in science, but in intuitive inclinations and mystical dreams, i.e. objectively deny the need in a scientific world outlook. It is characteristic that this

The problem of preventing a world thermonuclear war is the principal but not the only problem that troubles mankind today. Progressing internationalisation and intensification of all aspects of social life have resulted in a situation where mankind has encountered a qualitatively new type of problems called global. Together with the problem of how to prevent a world war and halt the arms race, other global issues are: the problem of optimal correlation between the rates of economic and social growth in developed and developing countries; the problem of rationally utilising natural, primarily unreplenishable resources; the problem of protecting man and the environment from the negative consequences of the scientific and technological revolution; the problem of providing the world's population with effective sources of food and energy; the problem of utilising the achievements of the scientific and technological revolution for the benefit of mankind (by eliminating the most dangerous and widespread diseases, exploring space and the World Ocean, and so on); and the pursuance of an active demographic policy. In other words, global problems involve those that affect the interests of all mankind and which, if unresolved, may create a real danger to its future. Being characterised by a broad range of influence on modern society both in space and time, the global problems, in order to be resolved, require all-round, continuous, and situationally unaffected international cooperation of all the peoples of the world, and maximally conjugated efforts by all mankind.

In tackling global problems, bourgeois ideology proceeds from two extremes: on the one hand, from technological determinism, which absolutises the role of technological systems and industrial factors in social development (R. Aron, W. Rostow, J. Galbraith, O. Toffler, and others) and, on the other, from abstract humanism, which absolutises "human" and moral dimensions of social development. In this case, the common denominator for both conceptions is the desire to integrate capitalism in future human development. It should be noted that the "anthropological slant" is becoming increasingly popular among a considerable number of Western scientists and public figures. This is due to the

That is why the sole alternative to the arms race which leads to a world catastrophe is disarmament, the struggle for peace.

From time immemorial, people have perfected the art of warfare. The present-day political situation makes it urgent to work out a "strategy of peace." In resolving this problem, Marxism is guided by a class, concrete historical approach constituting the principal difference of Marxism from sentimental altruism and pacifism. This approach differentiates between just and unjust peace, between passive (negative) peace, whose synonym is "cold war", and active (positive) peace, whose synonym is detente. In perspective, the human ideal is a universal, just and democratic peace based on political and military detente, on all-round international cooperation.

The infrastructure of peace is controversial: along with political, economic, scientific, technological and cultural cooperation there exist political struggle, economic competition, and ideological confrontation. Peace is essentially a unity of cooperation and confrontation, i.e. a unity of opposites. This theoretical tenet of Marxism manifests itself in the peaceful coexistence of states with different social systems.

Peaceful coexistence has become a categorical imperative of present-day society. Thousands of millions of people on earth associate their hopes and aspirations with peace. The struggle for peace comes out as a powerful consolidating factor uniting representatives of highly diverse political convictions and orientations, and Communists stand in the vanguard of this struggle. Marxists-Leninists were always distinguished by an exceptionally developed feeling of historical responsibility for the cause of peace, by understanding of the fact that the struggle for peace is a continuous process requiring constant effort. Not war preparations that doom the peoples to a senseless squandering of their material and spiritual wealth, but consolidation of peace that is the clue to the future.

Social progress in an antagonistic society is always limited, since it is "only achieved by a historical process during which individuals are sacrificed."¹ This social situation, when victories in history are paid for too dear price, Marx called "regressive metamorphosis", and Lenin "civilised barbarism".

Transition of mankind to socialism frees historical progress of its antagonistic form, and fills it with humanistic essence. Only under socialism, Marx wrote, "will human progress cease to resemble that hideous, pagan idol, who would not drink the nectar but from the skulls of the slain."² Socialist society provides broad opportunities for rapid and all-round social progress. In foreseeing this, Lenin wrote: "... Only socialism will be the beginning of a rapid, genuine, truly mass forward movement, embracing first the majority and then the whole of the population, in all spheres of public and private life."³ The highest historical form of social progress is communist civilisation.

Marxism was always far removed from primitive-utopian concretisations and naive prophecies on communist organisation of society. It is for future generations to detail the course of communist construction. Yet, the principal contours of the coming communist society were described by the classics of Marxism quite definitely.

From the Marxist viewpoint, communism represents "the world-historic existence" "developing the wealth of human nature as an end in itself" (K. Marx). The universal development of productive forces based on the use of the latest achievements of the scientific and technological revolution, comprehensive mechanisation and automation of social production will be a premise for such development in communist society. Revolutionary changes in production will bring about quantitative reduction of labour and its qualitative trans-

1."K. Marx, Theories of Surplus-Value, Part II, Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1975, p. 118.

2."K. Marx, F. Engels, Collected Works, Vol. 12, p. 222.

3."V.I. Lenin, Collected Works, Vol. 25, p. 477.

growing awareness of the urgent need for moral regulation and humanistic guarantees of scientific and technological progress, which, in developing spontaneously and not being directed consciously, "leaves a desert after itself" (Marx). This approach is distinctly revealed in the latest investigations of the Club of Rome, an international organisation of scientists specialising in the study of global problems of world development. The Club's leaders develop the view that global problems may be resolved only with fundamental transformation of "human quality", which would lead to a "new humanism".

Such arguments are, in effect, a hypertrophied form of the principle, which in its rational shape constitutes the theoretical foundation of Marxism, namely that the actual "reference-point" in the historical process is the social man. The future strategy for solving global problems must therefore combine in itself the scientific, social and humanistic approaches, with the latter having priority influence. In this instance, the statement by the ancient Greek philosopher Protagoras that "man is the measure for all things" acquires a new profound meaning. Precisely the problem of man and his future is the core around which the solution of all global problems should revolve. And since communism alone can provide free and all-round human development, the sole possible premise for resolving global issues would be the prospect of global communism. Marxists do not conceal this; however, being realists, they proceed from the fact that this final objective would be achieved gradually, during a historically lengthy period of the coexistence of and struggle between socialism and capitalism. Hence, the future strategy for resolving global issues stems from the realities of the present. It clearly defines not only the final objective, but the closer historical reference-points as well. It recognises the need for a broad and constructive dialogue between representatives of various social forces, and provides additional opportunities for developing international cooperation. Only all-round international cooperation could ensure mankind irrevocable progress.

not be replaced by the kingdom of universal anarchy and total permissiveness, but by a system of social self-government, i.e. by direct participation of all the mass of the people in management of public affairs. Social self-government presumes the existence of the new man and, in turn, creates the latter. The distinctive features of the man of the future will be high communist consciousness and organisation, diligence, honesty, decency, loyalty to one's work collective, and readiness and ability to regard public interests as one's own. Such qualities of the free and equal citizens of the new society will make communism a highly organised and coordinated community of people, real masters of creative communist labour.

Communist society will bring qualitatively new international relations based on broad and all-round cooperation. It may be said that communism will impart a new lofty meaning to the very notion "mankind" by transforming the human race into a single world community. This will usher up the era of lofty humanistic principles of the communist ideal, which proclaims Peace, Work, Liberty, Equality, Fraternity and Happiness.

The modern era is that of triumph of the Marxist-Leninist teaching. Socialism, which was first a dream, then a theory, and then a movement, after the victory of the Great October Socialist Revolution became socio-political reality. There is no loftier, nobler, and more responsible task than the struggle for establishing socialism throughout the world, the struggle for realising the communist ideal.

formation, and this will make it possible to give them /people/ all-round development and all-round training, so that they are able to do everything.¹ Communism liberates man from the life-long chains of one's profession and asserts as its subject a universally and harmoniously developed individual capable of creatively asserting himself in any historically developed forms of human activity. Interpenetration of science and art and aesthetisation of technological processes will make all kinds of work attractive. From a time deleted from life, labour will turn into a form for enrichment of life, "the highest enjoyment known to us".² Transformation of work into a free play of physical and spiritual forces will lead to gradual overcoming of opposites between work and recreation and make work free and recreation productive.

Free and highly productive work in communist society will allow to achieve full abundance. The great principle of communism will be the social formula "from each according to his abilities, to each according to his needs." The implementation of this principle will become possible because work according to one's abilities would become the primary requirement of each, and the needs themselves would be highly cultural and humanistic. The continuous growth of these needs will promote a search for new social possibilities to satisfy them.

Developed communist society will be characterised by complete social equality of all its members. Equality not in the sense of primitive levelling of personalities, but in the sense of creating equal social opportunities for the development of each individual. Such social equality will signify the complete triumph of the free individual, whose subjective vital interests will coincide with society's objective interests. Free development of each individual will condition free development of all.

Free development of the individual under communism does not mean disintegration of social ties. Statehood will

1. V.I. Lenin, Collected Works, Vol. 31, p. 50.

2. K. Marx, F. Engels, Collected Works, Vol. 4, 1976, p. 415.